DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 064 UD 028 061

AUTHOR Lieberman, Ann, Ed.
TITLE Schools as Collaborative Cultures: Creating the Future Now.
REPORT NO. ISBN-1-85000-673-3
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 264p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Falmer Press, Taylor and Francis Inc., 1900 Frost Road, Suite 101, Bristol, PA 19007.
PUB TYPE Books (010) -- Collected Works - General (020)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperation; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Organizational Change; *Organizational Development; *Participative Decision Making; Professional Autonomy; *School Organization; *School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

This collection of 12 essays examines the school's need to establish a collaborative environment as a precondition for its own development. The following chapters explore the necessary shift in schools from a bureaucratic to a professional mode: (1) "Recanting Bureaucracy: A Democratic Structure for Leadership in Schools" (D. L. Clarke and J. M. Meloy); (2) "Teacher Professionalism: Why and How" (L. Darling-Hammond); and (3) "What Are Schools of Education For?" (S. B. Sarason). The following chapters examine critical issues of fundamental change: (4) "A Fundamental Puzzle of School Reform" (L. Cuban); (5) "Education Reform Strategies: Will They Increase Teacher Commitment?" (S. J. Rosenholz); (6) "Teaching Incentives: Constraint and Variety" (G. Sykes); and (7) "Healing Our Schools: Restoring the Heart" (T. E. Deal). The following chapters investigate the changing roles, relationships, and culture of the school: (8) "The Social Realities of Teaching" (A. Liebermann and L. Miller); (9) "Teachers as Colleagues" (J. W. Little); (10) "Leadership for Curriculum Improvement: The School Administrator's Role" (G. A. Griffin); (11) "Staff Development and School Change" (M. W. McLaughlin and D. D. Marsh); and (12) "Schools for the Twenty-first Century: The Conditions for Invention" (P. C. Schlechty). Two figures are included. Each chapter includes a list of references. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SCHOOLS AS COLLABORATIVE CULTURES: CREATING THE FUTURE NOW. EDITED BY ANN LIEBERMAN

ED 333064

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Eve. Spreisard

Taylor & Francis Group

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Falmer Press

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT AND THE MANAGEMENT OF CHANGE SERIES: 3

JO 023 061

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Schools as Collaborative Cultures: Creating the Future Now

School Development and the Management of Change Series

Series Editors: Peter Holly and Geoff Southworth
Cambridge Institute of Education
Cambridge, CB2 2BX, UK

1 THE DEVELOPING SCHOOL
Peter Holly and Geoff Southworth, Cambridge Institute of Education, UK

2 HERE COMES THE ASSEMBLY MAN
A Year in the Life of a Primary School
Fred Sedgwick, UK

3 SCHOOLS AS COLLABORATIVE CULTURES
Creating the Future Now
Edited by Ann Lieberman, University of Washington, USA

Forthcoming titles in the series:

SEMI-DETACHED TEACHERS
Building Support and Advisory Relationships in Classrooms
Colin Biott, Newcastle upon Tyne Polytechnic, UK

ASSESSMENT AND TESTING IN THE PRIMARY SCHOOL
Colin Conner, Cambridge Institute of Education, UK

PRIMARY EDUCATION
From Plowden to the 1990s
Norman Thomas, Honorary Professor at the University of Warwick, UK

THE MANAGEMENT OF CHANGE IN THE PRIMARY SCHOOL
Implementing the National Curriculum in Science and Design Technology
Anne Pennell and David Alexander, Bedfordshire Education Service, UK

School Development and the Management of Change Series: 3

Schools as Collaborative Cultures: Creating the Future Now

Edited by
Ann Lieberman

The Falmer Press
(A member of the Taylor & Francis Group)
New York • Philadelphia • London

UK The Falmer Press, Rankine Road, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG24 0PR

USA The Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis Inc., 1900 Frost Road, Suite 101, Bristol, PA 19007

©Selection and editorial material copyright Ann Lieberman

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without permission in writing from the Publisher.

First published 1990

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Schools as collaborative cultures: creating the future now. — (School development and the management of change).
1. United States. Schools
I. Lieberman, Ann II. Series
371'.00973

ISBN 1-85000-672-5
ISBN 1-85000-673-3 pbk

Jacket design by Caroline Archer

Typeset in 10½/11 Bembo by
Chapterhouse, The Cloisters, Formby L37 3PX

Printed and bound in Great Britain by Taylor & Francis (Printers) Ltd. Basingstoke on paper which has a specified pH value on final paper manufacture of not less than 7.5 and is therefore 'acid free'.

Contents

Acknowledgments *vii*

Series Editors' Preface *ix*

Introduction *xi*

Part 1: Understanding What We Value 1

Chapter 1 Recanting Bureaucracy: A Democratic Structure for Leadership in Schools
David L. Clark and Judith M. Meloy 3

Chapter 2 Teacher Professionalism: Why and How
Linda Darling-Hammond 25

Chapter 3 What Are Schools of Education For?
Seymour B. Sarason 51

Part 2: Examining Critical Issues of Fundamental Change 69

Chapter 4 A Fundamental Puzzle of School Reform
Larry Cuban 71

Chapter 5 Education Reform Strategies: Will They Increase Teacher Commitment?
Susan J. Rosenholtz 79

Chapter 6 Teaching Incentives: Constraint and Variety
Gary Sykes 103

Chapter 7 Healing Our Schools: Restoring the Heart
Terrence E. Deal 127

Part 3: Changing the Roles, Relationships and the Culture of Schools 151

Chapter 8 The Social Realities of Teaching
Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller 153

Chapter 9 Teachers as Colleagues
Judith Warren Little 165

Chapter 10 Leadership for Curriculum Improvement: The School Administrator's Role
Gary A. Griffin 195
Chapter 11 Staff Development and School Change
Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin and David D. Marsh 213
Chapter 12 Schools for the Twenty-first Century: The Conditions for Invention
Phillip C. Schlechty 233

Notes on Contributors 257
Index 259

Acknowledgments

Chapter 1 David L. Clark and Judith M. Meloy, 'Recanting Bureaucracy: A Democratic Structure for Leadership in Schools' is reproduced with permission from Sergiovanni, T. M. and Moore, J. H. (Eds) (1989) *Schooling for Tomorrow*, Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

Chapter 2 Linda Darling-Hammond, 'Teacher Professionalism: Why and How' is a paper commissioned by Ann Lieberman for the Task Force on Professionalism in New York City, April, 1988.

Chapter 3 Seymour B. Sarason, 'What are Schools of Education For?' is a speech delivered at the 50th Anniversary Education Convocation Address, Syracuse University, September 1983.

Chapter 4 Larry Cuban, 'A Fundamental Puzzle of School Reform' first appeared in *Kappan* January 1988, pp. 341–44 and is reproduced with permission from Pauline Gough, Kappan, Box 789, Bloomington, Indiana.

Chapter 5 Susan J. Rosenholtz, 'Education Reform Strategies: Will They Increase Teacher Commitment?' first appeared in *American Journal of Education*, Volume 95, 4, August 1987, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp. 534–62.

Chapter 6 Gary Sykes, 'Teaching Incentives: Constraint and Variety' was first published by the NCREL for the proceedings of a conference and is reproduced with permission from the North Central Regional Laboratory (NCREL), Illinois, USA.

Chapter 7 Terrence E. Deal, 'Healing Our Schools: Restoring the Heart' is adapted from 'Cultural Change: Opportunities, Silent Killer, or Metamorphosis?' in Kirkman, R., Saxton, M. and Serpa, R. (Eds) (1985) *Gaining Control of the Corporate Culture*, San Francisco, Jossey Bass, pp. 292–331.

Chapter 8 Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller, 'The Social Realities of Teaching' is reproduced with permission from Lieberman, A. and Miller, L. (1980) *Teachers: Their World and Their Work*, Alexandria, Virginia, The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Chapter 9 Judith Warren Little, 'Teachers as Colleagues' is reproduced with permission from V. Richardson-Koehler (1987) *Educators' Handbook: A Research Perspective*, New York, Longman, pp. 491–518.

Chapter 10 Gary Griffin, 'Leadership for Curriculum Improvement: The School Administrator's Role' is taken from Section Three, 'Issues of Leadership' in Tanner, L. N. (Ed) (1988) *Critical Issues in Curriculum*, the Eighty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp. 244–86. Reproduced with permission from Kenneth J. Rehage of the NSSE.

Chapter 11 An earlier version of McLaughlin and Marsh's chapter, 'Staff Development and School Change' appeared in *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*, (1978), New York, Teachers College Press and is reproduced with permission from Carole Saltz, Teachers College Press.

Chapter 12 Phillip Schlechty, 'Schools for the Twenty-first Century: The Conditions for Invention' first appeared in the *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44, and is reproduced with permission from the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education.

141

Series Editors' Preface

This book is a collection of 'essays' from a brace of the best commentators American education has to offer. It provides rich testimony to the power of teacher collaboration within school development. As we maintained in the lead volume to this series (Holly and Southworth, 1989), teacher collaboration is a key activity in The Developing School. The contributions offered here provide a set of improvisations on the same theme; that each school needs to establish a collaborative culture as a precondition for its own development. Associated themes touched upon here include bureaucratic schooling (the antithesis of collaborative schooling), democratic leadership, teacher professionalism and teacher leadership, teacher involvement in decision-making and 'colleagueship' (or collegiality). Moreover, many of the authors represented here would seem to equate teacher collaboration with teacher empowerment, an enhanced sense of professionalism and, indeed, the restructuring of schooling.

There is undoubted power in collaboration, as this quotation from a teacher 'collaborator' would suggest:

> (Because of the collaborative team-work) there are so many more times to celebrate, so many more people to celebrate with, so much more to celebrate . . . . Looking back, let me sum it up this way. The literature circles project is a wonderfully rewarding experience for both teachers and students. It is also a huge, overwhelming and sometimes frustrating undertaking and there's a very good chance I would not have stuck with it if I had not had the other 'guinea pig' teachers to fall back on. In a profession which all too often relies on each individual doing his/her job independently, working as a collaborative teaching team is a refreshing change of pace and . . . also a matter of survival, maintaining your sanity, and achieving success.

These comments, from the member of a collaborative team of teachers, witness the power in collaborative inquiry within collaborative implementation. The focus is on teachers 'coaching' each other, reflecting on their common experiences and building the curriculum together . . . and, in so doing, creating a climate or culture of acceptance for this kind of mutuality of support. As Slavin (1987) has emphasized, 'The collaborative school provides a climate and a structure that encourage teachers to work together and with the principal and other administrators toward school improvement and professional growth.' School improvement, when defined in terms of student learning outcomes, is

what teacher collaboration is for. Collaboration is the process, the 'product' of which is improved teaching and learning in every classroom. As Judith Warren Little has emphasized elsewhere,

> In one of . . . the schools, classroom observation is so frequent, so intellectually lively and intense, and so thoroughly integrated into the daily work and so associated with accomplishments for all who participate, that it is difficult to see how the practices could fail to improve teaching. (Little, 1981)

It is clearly a matter of professionalization and internalization (the mobilization of the change process from within) leading to a strengthening of staff relationships which, in turn, enhances the performances of teachers and students alike. These important themes are returned to time and time again in this volume and, in our opinion, they are the themes which will make for genuine and lasting educational changes in the 1990s.

If collaboration for development is a theme of this series, collaboration as development is the theme of this book — which we warmly recommend to you.

Peter Holly and Geoff Southworth
Series Editors

12

Introduction

Ann Lieberman

This book is a collection of articles or chapters written by intellectual and scholarly leaders of the school reform movement in the United States and selected from a variety of books and journals. Although they take different approaches to the discussion of the needs, processes, problems, possibilities and practices for changing schools, they all share some common themes. These themes include the creation of community in schools, the struggle to understand and develop the use of such ideas as commitment, incentives, colleagueship and leadership, and the desire fundamentally to rethink how schools can change. None of these authors looks at the topic idealistically, but, rather, they all engage in the struggle to be both visionary and realistic, to build futures rooted in the realities of schools. Such a stance, we believe, allows all of us involved in the work of schools not only to deepen our understanding of the complexities of making change in schools, but also to use what we know from practice, research and theory to do better work. From the schools of education, where teachers and principals are 'prepared' for their work in schools, to the contexts wherein they 'become' professionals and leaders, changes are suggested.

The book is divided into three parts. In the first, three chapters explore the necessary shift in schools from a bureaucratic to a professional mode. Clark and Meloy argue that the assumptions about people and the structure of work in schools are 'unreasonable, unwise and unnecessary'. They propose an alternative to the bureaucratic structure, focusing on a broader view of leadership for schools, counseling patience in the building of new forms. Darling-Hammond continues the discussion as she sets forth reasons why professionalizing teaching could fundamentally change schools. Her argument links issues of status, autonomy and respect for teachers to the vital question of whether professionalization will 'increase the probability that students will be well-educated'. Both articles present powerful sociological analyses in support of these changes. Sarason's chapter encourages schools of education to use history as a source of knowledge so that they may better see how changes in the society have an impact on schools. He urges colleges of education to be concerned with problems of practice, to have at least a portion of an education faculty engaged in seeking to understand the realities of school life.

The second part examines the tough issues involved in the process of change itself — the necessities for and the difficulties of fundamental rather than superficial change. Cuban's article poses two types of change. His discussion and analysis of 'first' and

'second' order change puts into historical, political and organizational perspective the necessity for framing the big questions so that fundamental changes may be instituted. Rosenholtz, using data from two reform efforts (minimal competency testing and career ladders), discusses and analyzes the connections between teachers' academic success with students and their sense of efficacy and commitment — making clearer the connection and delicate nature of the teacher-student relationship. Sykes, deepening the discussion of teachers and teaching, poses two perspectives which dominate the thinking of policy-makers: one, the prescriptive approach to change with its consequent constraints, and the other, the awarness or lack of it, of the variety that exists among teachers and settings. Deal, in his chapter, educates us to the critical importance of myth and symbol as we attempt to change the organizational culture of the school.

The last part goes into the schools themselves, as the authors describe what the changing culture of a school looks like, what the conditions are that support constructive change and how the roles and relationships change. Lieberman and Miller begin the section by exploring the notions of rhythms, rules, interactions and feelings of teachers in their day-to-day work with students. Little, using both her own research and that of others, documents 'close up' the practices and the problems of building colleagueship among teachers. Using research to guide him, Griffin builds an important case for the role of principal as promoter of curriculum work for the 'teacher as classroom executive', redefining educational leadership for both teacher and principal in the process. In their classic article, McLaughlin and Marsh document the necessary conditions for implementing constructive change in schools. Evidence from the nation-wide Rand Change Agent Study found in this 1978 article enlarged our knowledge of implementation strategies and altered the direction of research into school change for the next decade. Ending the volume, Schlechty provides us with a dramatic vision of how schools of the twenty-first century should look. Ending where we began, the fundamental reform issues are now practically *and* conceptually described. As Schlechty states in closing: 'All visions are dangerous and can lead to excess, but without vision, the future will happen to us. With a clear vision, we are in position to help invent what happens.'

PART I

Understanding What We Value

Chapter 1

Recanting Bureaucracy: A Democratic Structure for Leadership in Schools

David L. Clark and Judith M. Meloy

This chapter has a concern and a viewpoint that go beyond the question of restructuring the roles of teachers and principals. The concern is that contemporary organizations have sacrificed the freedom of their employees in favor of control over those employees to the disadvantage of both the employee and the organization. The viewpoint is that the decision to do so is based upon assumptions about people and organizational structure that are unreasonable, unwise and unnecessary.

Reflections on Leadership and Structure

The images of and metaphors for structure and leadership in the literature of organizations are scant in number and similar in content. Before turning to a systematic examination of our concern and viewpoint we offer two metaphors that affected our approach to the topic.

A Metaphor for Leadership

Consider, for a moment, an alternative metaphor for leadership suggested by Walker Percy in *The Thanatos Syndrome*. His narrator reports this 'secret belief' transmitted by Dr Harry Stack Sullivan to his residents:

> Here's the secret . . . . You take that last patient we saw. Offhand, what would you say about him? A loser, right? A loser by all counts. You know what you're all thinking to yourself? You're thinking, No wonder that guy is depressed. He's entitled to be depressed. If I were he, I'd be depressed too. Right? Wrong. You're thinking the most we can do for him is make him feel a little better, give him a pill or two, a little pat or two. Right? Wrong. Here's the peculiar thing and I'll never understand why this is so: *Each patient this side*

> *of psychosis, and even some psychotics, has the means of obtaining what he needs, she needs, with a little help from you.* Incidentally, Doctors, how do we know you don't look like losers to me, or I to you.[1]

The narrator continues:

> But there it was, to me the pearl of great price, the treasure buried in a field, that is to say, the patient's truest unique self which lies within his, the patient's, power to reach and which we, as little as we do, can help him reach.
>
> Do you know that this is true? I don't know why or how, but it is true. People can get better, can come to themselves, . . . with a little help from you.[2]

Suspend more traditional metaphors for leadership and imagine that Dr Sullivan had been thinking about a school and had been querying a group of administrative interns. How easily do we fall into the habit of classifying the teachers in 'our' school? How many do we classify as losers, recalcitrants, drones? How many teachers do we give up on? How hard do we try to manipulate them to do what we think needs to be done or to force them to leave if they do not respond?

Suppose the object were to figure out what it is that the teachers need rather than what the school needs? Need to do what? Need to tap into each one's truest, unique self; to reach so that s/he has a chance to succeed; to become what every person desires to become — an effective, recognized, rewarded individual in their work setting.

Our skills in and tools of administration have not been designed to fit the psychiatric metaphor. We assume that someone, other than the classroom teacher, has the knowledge and the wisdom to assert organizational goals, which are monitored with such devices as management by objectives, teacher evaluation systems and curricular syllabuses. The output of these control mechanisms can then be brought to bear on the analysis of the teaching staff. Consequently, they can be classified and provided with technical staff development interventions to help them become better than they are.

But this is no technical business in which we are engaged. Success in staff training programs is like success in stopping or reducing smoking, drinking, gambling or drugs. The individual has to want to take the action. Staff training has to follow the discovery of one's unique self. The intrinsic compulsion to succeed, in any role, follows from the discovery of one's unique self. When administrators foster that compulsion in others, then the strength of the school as an adaptive, excellent unit increases permanently. When they fail to do so, the pills and the pats are useless tools for improvement.

A Metaphor for Organizational Structure

Turn to an alternative metaphor for organizational structure suggested by the Declaration of Independence of the United States. The assumptions posited by the framers laid the foundation for the political structures that followed. The self-evident truths were five in number, the guarantee to all persons of (1) equality, (2) life, (3) liberty, and (4) the pursuit of happiness based on (5) the consent of the governed.

Contrast this set of conditions with the assumptions underlying classical bureaucracy. Weber noted:

171

> Bureaucratization offers above all the optimum possibility for carrying through the principle of specializing administrative functions according to purely objective considerations. Individual performances are allocated to functionaries who have specialized training and who by constant practice learn more and more. The 'objective' discharge of business primarily means a discharge of business according to *calculable rules* and 'without regard for persons.'[3]

Weber continued:

> [Bureaucracy by] its specific nature . . . develops the more perfectly the more the bureaucracy is 'dehumanized,' the more completely it succeeds in eliminating from official business love, hatred, and all purely personal, irrational, and emotional elements which escape calculation. This is the specific nature of bureaucracy and it is appraised as its special virtue.[4]

What an interesting contrast. The Declaration of Independence is built solely on assumptions about persons. Bureaucracy assumes that organizational structure can be considered 'without regard for persons.' Once the structure is considered apart from people, the consent of the governed in the designation of leaders is inappropriate because election reduces 'the strictness of hierarchical subordination.'[5] Domination and power assume precedence over liberty and the pursuit of happiness, as Weber noted:

> The professional bureaucrat is chained to his activity by his entire material and ideal existence. In the great majority of cases, he is only a single cog in an ever-moving mechanism which prescribes to him an essentially fixed route of march . . . . [and] As an instrument for 'societalizing' relations of power, bureaucracy has been and is a power instrument of the first order — for the one who controls the bureaucratic apparatus.[6]

Suppose, then, that one could imagine an organizational structure with the individual as its building block, exhibiting a total regard for persons. Reasonably, this personal model would trade off control for empowerment, domination for freedom, and authority for consent. An organization built on these principles would choose its members and leaders, concern itself with the self-actualization of all its members, share the power tools of the organization, de-emphasize hierarchical relationships, and create opportunities for self-fulfilling jobs.

In fact, the Declaration of Independence as a metaphor for structure would require a leadership style and leader behavior similar to that described by the metaphor of the administrator as psychoanalyst. In both instances the design would be built around the needs of the professional staff of the school.

These two metaphors do not fit the modal conditions in American schools. They are not the metaphors on which either leader behavior or structure in schools has been based. American schools are bureaucracies. The root structural metaphor for Max Weber was clear: 'the fully developed bureaucratic mechanism compares with other organizations exactly as does the machine with the non-mechanical modes of production.'[7] Our metaphors for leadership suggest an individual in control, holding onto rather than passing the buck, mobilizing the troops, running a lean and mean organization, making hard

decisions, not running a popularity contest. This chapter will argue that two sets of interacting assumptions about (1) people and (2) organizational structure are paralyzing efforts to modify the roles of principals and teachers in schools. As we try to modify one set of assumptions, the other jumps to the fore and we conclude that the demands of practicality make basic change impossible.

But one person's practicality is another person's will-o'-the-wisp. The definition of practicality is derived from the assumptions one makes about the factors that effect practicalness in specific circumstances or situations. Our view of schools currently is that they are impractical organizations because they are based on incorrect assumptions about both persons and structure. They are inappropriate as well as impractical because they impose a system of control on the learning situation which inhibits the successful conduct of the teaching-learning act. However, these conclusions should be held in abeyance pending a more systematic examination of assumptions held commonly about people in organizations and organizational structure.

Assumptions about the Person in Work Organizations

Fifty years ago Chester Barnard was grappling with the place of the individual in organizational theory. He reminded his readers of the tendency for the 'person' to become 'people' as we think about him or her as 'them'.

> Sometimes in everyday work an individual is something absolutely unique, with a special history in every respect. This is usually the sense in which we regard ourselves, and so also our nearest relations, then our friends and associates . . . . The farther we push away from ourselves the less the word 'individual' means what it means when applied to you and me . . . .[8]

The complication of talking about the individual without categorizing her/him into clusters of 'them' confuses the theoretician just as it does the practitioner. How can you make assumptions about people that fit persons? Well, of course, you cannot. So the theoretician falls back to the position of modal assumptions about people. How do you think most people feel about themselves, their work, their relations with others? Are there some assumptions about people that are more valid or more heuristic in dealing with individuals than other assumptions? Are there some more likely to be true of more people in more work situations? Have some assumptions or sets of assumptions about people had more or less influence on the theories of structuring work organizations?

Organizational theorists have argued for thirty years that the answer to these questions is 'yes', from the complicated explication by Robert Presthus of Harry Stack Sullivan's interpersonal theory to the simpler formulations of Douglas McGregor and Chris Argyris based on behavioral and personality theory.[9]

Theory X and Theory Y

Douglas McGregor asserted that there were a few pervasive assumptions about human

-19

nature and human behavior that are implicit in both the theory and practice of management:

1 The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.
2 Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.
3 The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, wants security above all.[10]

He contended that these assumptions, which he labeled 'Theory X', influenced managerial strategy although they did not describe accurately human behavior. He argued that these assumptions were not straw men but were, in fact, the dominant assumptions in the heads of managers.

> This assumption of the 'mediocrity of the masses' is rarely expressed so bluntly. In fact, a good deal of lip service is given to the ideal of the worth of the average human being. Our political and social values demand such public expressions. Nevertheless, a great many managers will give private support to this assumption, and it is easy to see it reflected in policy and practice.[11]

So it is this very day.

In contrast, McGregor asserted a set of generalizations about human behavior that, he contended, represented a view of behavior better supported by the findings of social science:

1 The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest. The average human being does not inherently dislike work . . . .
2 . . . Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.
3 Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement . . . .
4 The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility . . . .
5 The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population . . . .[12]

McGregor concluded his argument by noting that, 'if employees are lazy, indifferent, unwilling to take responsibility, intransigent, uncreative, uncooperative, Theory Y implies that the causes lie in management's methods of organization and control' and not on 'the nature of the human resources with which we must work.'[13]

Self-Actualization: Developmental Trends of Human Personality

Three years before the publication of McGregor's work, Chris Argyris attempted to

present an integrated picture of the behavioral sciences and organization in a volume he subtitled 'The Conflict between System and the Individual'. Argyris rooted the conflict in seven assumptions about developmental personality trends of individuals in our culture. He argued that these dimensions are descriptive of a basic multidimensional process toward self-actualization which is 'characteristic of a relatively large majority of the population . . . ':[14]

1 from a state of *passivity* to *activity*; increasingly self-initiatory and self-determinative;
2 from a state of *dependence* to *independence*;
3 from *behaving in only a few ways* to *being capable of behaving in many different ways*;
4 from having erratic, casual, *shallow interests* to *deeper interests*;
5 from having a *short time perspective* to a *longer time perspective*;
6 from being in a *subordinate position* to aspiring to occupy an *equal and/or superordinate position* relative to their peers;
7 from a *lack of awareness of self* to an *awareness of and control over self*.[15]

Argyris contended that these developmental trends were basic properties of the human personality. Theoretically, this means that mature adults 'will want to express needs or predispositions related to the adult end of each specific developmental continuum.'[16] He went on to present empirical evidence, 'to support the proposition that the basic impact of the formal organizational structure is to make the employees feel dependent, submissive, and passive, and to require them to utilize only a few of their less important abilities.'[17]

Fifty years ago, thirty years ago, twenty-five years ago and today these same propositions sound true and troublesome:

1 The uniqueness of the individual, a truism in the way in which we view ourselves, is lost as we view others in the organization.
2 Most of us, most of the time, typify our subordinates, colleagues and often superordinates as exhibiting Theory X characteristics. We believe, rather ordinarily, that superordinates view us as Theory X performers. We are each, of course, certain of our own status as Theory Y performers.
3 All of us concur that Argyris' developmental continuum describes our own personality growth pattern but are (a) uncertain that it describes that of our colleagues and subordinates and (b) certain that limits have to be placed on fostering this development in the workplace.

Assumptions about the Structure of Work Organizations

Why are we making such stumbling progress toward modifying practice in our work organizations to fit what have been generally accepted theoretical propositions about human behavior and personality for decades? In the field of education, for example, the restricted role of the classroom teacher looks little different than it did thirty years ago.

One explanation is self-contained under the heading 'assumptions about the person'. A reasonable argument can be mounted that a natural characteristic of people is to distrust

and undervalue others. Another possibility is that our assumptions about organizational structure reinforce that 'natural' tendency by allowing us to rationalize our negative view of people in more acceptable terms, e.g., 'I really believe in the creativity, energy, ambition and independence of people, but you just can't tolerate anarchy in school or business or . . . ' In fact, these are complementary explanations. Not only can each position serve to rationalize the other, but each tends to force us to accept the other. Presthus, quoting Harry Stack Sullivan, described what we believe to be the case in explaining our tolerance, even encouragement, of unacceptable work situations for employees in and outside education:

> The human organism is so extraordinarily adaptive that not only could the most fantastic social rules and regulations be lived up to, if they were properly inculcated in the young, but they would seem very natural and proper ways of life.[18]

Presthus noted the blindness to alternatives in organization induced by our organizational assumptions:

> We tend moreover to restrict our thinking about individual freedom to government, concluding that freedom is assured when public power is controlled. But somehow the logic of freedom which is so compelling in this public context is often neglected where private power is concerned. There, despite the intimate relationship between conditions of work and self-realization, the implications of the concentrated power now characteristic of our society have usually been ignored.[19]

Traditional Assumptions about Structure in Schools

The basic assumptions of bureaucracy are the foundation for structural planning and implementation in school organizations. They can be imagined, in effect, as a kind of Theory X^1, i.e., the traditional assumptions held about organizational structure by most people who work in organizational settings.

There is an overarching assumption that bureaucracy is an inevitable structural form for work organizations large or complex enough so that daily contact among all employees is impossible. Almost all school systems and the majority of schools meet this criterion. Consequently:

> Assumption 1 *The basic bureaucratic form is the only way in which school systems and schools can be organized.*

Bureaucracy, as an organizational form, carries with it a set of minimal unavoidable elements. Bureaucracy makes no sense without a hierarchy. The hierarchy serves two functions of the bureaucracy: official authority and specialization. The principal of a school assumes a set of specialized functions of an administrative nature in the building while simultaneously representing the point in the scalar hierarchy where the 'buck stops' within the building unit. We assume that:

Assumption 2 *All schools need principals* to carry out administrative functions and to represent the authority of a system in the building unit.

How one becomes an administrator in a bureaucracy was made clear by Weber and has never been seriously challenged: 'The pure type of bureaucratic official is *appointed* by a superior authority. An official elected by the governed is not a purely bureaucratic figure.'[20] The reason: 'The designation of officials by means of an election among the governed modifies the strictness of hierarchical subordination.'[21]

Assumption 3 *School principals are appointed* by the elected school board on the recommendation of the chief school administrator.

The appointment of administrative officials in a bureaucratic system emphasizes the scalar characteristic of the hierarchy and ultimately its oligarchic nature. Power within the bureaucracy is centralized in the hands of a few. The mass of employees, if they are to negotiate with the oligarchy, must organize outside the hierachy to create an external power force to deal with 'their own organization'. Oligarchy and hierarchy, by centralizing authority and decision-making, seek to create a rational organization in pursuit of a set of generally agreed upon goals and objectives.

Assumption 4 *The school system sets goals and directions at the system level* taking into account advice and counsel from subordinate levels. This centralization is needed to support rational decision-making and accountability in the organization.

Two other features of bureaucracy, specialization and specification, have had particularly important effects on the organization of schools. The former characteristic is designed to provide for technical expertise in the system where such expertise is required. The latter clarifies the assignment and scope of responsibility of individual employees. The technical expertise of the teacher has been defined narrowly, i.e., as a subject and/or grade specialization *in the classroom*. Broader instructional expertise, curriculum development and planning, has typically been vested in staff and line administrators from curriculum specialists to the principal. The consequences for teachers have been several. Teachers have become isolated from one another and from the principal during the school day. The autonomy of the teacher in the classroom has resulted in the restriction of the teacher's role and responsibility to the teaching-learning act.

Assumption 5 *The teacher's role in the school occurs behind the classroom door.* The professional responsibility of the teacher does not include determining educational goals, curricular content, or making basic decisions about the operation of the school.

Finally, a unique characteristic of bureaucracy, often overlooked in descriptions of necessary elements, is its reliance on education and training. Weber foresaw the need for this development:

> The modern development of full bureaucratization brings the system of rational, specialized, and expert examinations irresistibly to the fore . . . . The

development is greatly furthered by the social prestige of the educational certificates acquired through such specialized examinations.[22]

This element is not introduced to stimulate a debate about whether teachers or administrators should be trained in their areas of specialization, but rather to highlight the field's commitment to certification and examination as a route to organizational effectiveness. The most popular reform tool introduced as a consequence of the criticism of education over the last five years has been standards manipulation through forms of external examination for teachers and students.

Assumption 6 *Office holders in schools should possess educational certificates*. Increasingly, proof of certificate eligibility will be established through external examinations.

Alternative Views of Structure: The Dilemma

Following the logic of the earlier section on assumptions about persons in work organizations, the reader might now expect that the characteristics of traditional organizational structure (Theory X^1) would be followed by a set of structural counter-assumptions (Theory Y^1). You might, for example, anticipate a form in which bureaucracy is eschewed; in which school-level leadership might or might not be provided by a single designated leader; in which leaders are identified and chosen by means other than appointment; in which goals and directions grow out of the successful activity of professionals working with clients; in which job definition evolves from the work of the professional; in which certification is a matter of concern among professionals based on norms of performance. Such a hypothetical configuration would be a Y^1 approach to organizational structure, a true alternative to bureaucracy.

Suppose one did exist. How far would it stretch our credulity? Is it more difficult to believe that 'schools do not need principals' than that 'man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed?' Is it easier to say 'principals should be elected' or 'the capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population?' We submit that the latter set of assumptions is much easier to accept than the former. Our impression is that the assumptions about organizational structure are more deeply embedded in our consciousness than those about people. That, we think, is the reason we honor those who assert alternative views of people while still finding it impossible to apply their ideas in practice.

This is not to say that those who asserted alternative views of persons did not attempt to apply those views to the organizational structure. The difficulty arose when they asked themselves to become 'practical' in applying their theoretical schema to organizations. McGregor, for example, had no illusions about the fit between bureaucracy and Theory Y. He noted 'the central principle of organization which derives from Theory X is that of direction and control through the exercise of authority — what has been called "the scalar principle".'[23] In comparing management's ineffective use of control in contrast to engineering he argued:

> In the human field . . . we often dig channels to make water flow uphill. Many of our attempts to control behavior, far from representing selective adaptions, are in direct violation of human nature. They consist in trying to make people behave as we wish without concern for natural law.[24]

But now listen to the relatively conservative tone of the recommendations by the same author in regard to organizational structure:

> What is the practical relevance for management of these findings of social science research in the field of leadership? . . . [1] *One of management's major tasks, therefore, is to provide a heterogeneous supply of human resources from which individuals can be selected to fill a variety of specific but unpredictable needs* . . . [2] A management development program should involve many people within the organization rather than a select few . . . [3] Management should have as a goal the development of the unique capacities and potentialities of each individual rather than common objectives for all participants . . . [4] The promotion policies of the company should be so administered that these heterogeneous resources are actually considered when openings occur . . . and [5] If leadership is a function — a complex relation between leader and situation — we ought to be clear that every promising recruit is *not* a potential member of top management.[25]

None of these recommendations requires the suspension in belief of any of the requisite structural characteristics of bureaucracy. They are reasonable adjustments that can be made within an existing structure which is, in fact, antithetical to the theoretical propositions about people to which the author subscribed.

But that was a quarter of a century ago. What about today? The dilemma of practicability stultifies even the most innovative of theorists. For example, Rosabeth Kanter in discussing the empowerment of individuals in organizations runs directly up against the limitations of thinking about people within the traditional structural model:

> Unlimited circulation of power in an organization without focus would mean that no one would ever get anything done beyond a small range of actions that people can carry out by themselves. Besides, the very idea of infinite power circulation sounds to some of us like a system out of control, unguided, in which anybody can start nearly anything. (And probably finish almost nothing.) Thus the last key to successful middle-management innovation is to see how power gets pulled out of circulation and focused long enough to permit project completion. But here we find an organizational dilemma. Some of the focusing conditions are contrary to the circulating conditions, almost by definition.[26]

Even analysts who begin with the consideration of structural alternatives often find themselves trapped, in the final analysis, in modest adjustments still based upon the traditional assumptions. Patterson, Purkey and Parker just published a monograph with the provocative title, *Productive School Systems for a Nonrational World*. In practice, however, the non-rational model sounds very rational indeed.

> Like the rational model, the nonrational model endorses the concept of organizational goals, but assigns a different meaning and importance to the construction of these goals. Both views of reality would argue that school districts do have a central mission: to improve learning and the quality of life in schools. When it comes to translating this mission statement into organizational goals, the nonrational and rational schools of thought part company.
>
> For instance, the board of education may have a long list of district goals as part of board policy. Individual schools could have their own list, and certain parent organizations may produce still another list they want the school or district to address. The key, within the nonrational model, is to use organizational energy optimally in serving a variety of legitimate goals across different lists — *as long as the district adheres to the overall mission of the organization*. [italics added][27]

In the example Patterson *et al.* assumed that the hierarchical responsibility for establishing goals was reasonable and necessary. They noted that idiosyncratic goals might also be stated at the school level so long as they did not conflict with board policy. They suggested that in the non-rational model conflicting goals can be met by delaying or sequencing their implementation, e.g., postponing the implementation of a program for the gifted until a program for computer literacy is in place. That is a sensible deviation from the rigidity of the traditional model but seems hardly to justify the nomenclature 'non-rational'.

This is not intended to be a criticism of Patterson *et al.* but rather to illustrate how very difficult it is to imagine what might be defined as a Y^1 organization — even one that might be termed arational rather than non-rational.

Alternative Views of Structure: Proposed Solutions

A familiar example of an organizational structure that does not conform to the necessary elements of bureaucracy is the organized anarchy described by Cohen and March.[28] They described a class of organizations with three pervasive characteristics: problematic goals, unclear technology, and fluid participation by the participants in organizational activities and interests. The authors argued that such organizations were 'not limited to educational institutions; but they are particularly conspicuous there. The American college or university is a prototypic organized anarchy.[29] This description is not judgmental. 'These factors do not make a university a bad organization or a disorganized one; but they do make it a problem to describe, understand, and lead.'[30]

This organizational form is not a theoretical construction. Cohen and March presented it as an empirical description of an organization that evolved within a conventional bureaucratic structure. The evolution occurred in a setting in which individual interests are apparently strong enough to modify, in a few essential ways, the basic elements of the bureaucracy.

The actual form, different in degree from university to university, is an unjustified variation in the bureaucratic model in response to the pressure of individual freedom.[31]

The consent of the governed, for example, may not be stretched to a vote of the faculty on a new dean, or president, or department chair (although it often is), but the faculty is almost always in the position to advise and consent. One is hard pressed to find universities without presidents, but it is common to discover departments where the role of chair is passed around from year to year. There are career administrators, but there are more career professionals who move among teaching, research and administration. The power tools of the organization — salary level, recruitment, promotion and tenure — are often held by the professorial staff. Curriculum is routinely in professorial hands. The university, as a consequence of this variation, is not a perfect organization; on the other hand, it is neither anarchical nor ineffective.

Another current commentator on organizational theory and leadership in schools addressed the specific issue being discussed in this section, i.e., the paucity of alternatives to the bureaucratic model. Foster argued:

> Administration must at its heart be informed by critical models oriented toward social justice and individual freedom. This is not just 'nice'; it determines our entire way of life and the purpose of our most important social institution, education.[32]

To illustrate alternatives to the bureaucratic model he suggested the bargaining model and the community democracy model, analogous to worker ownership in industry.

Gareth Morgan attempted to loosen the hold of X^1 assumptions by describing a variety of metaphors of organizational structure from the most conservative, i.e., organizations as machines; to less conservative but well-known, i.e., organizations as organisms, organizations as cultures, organizations as political systems; to more unconventional images, i.e., organizations as brains, psychic prisons, instruments of domination. Morgan argued that:

> Images and metaphors are not only interpretive constructs or ways of seeing; they also provide frameworks for action. Their use creates insights that often allow us to act in ways that we may not have thought possible before.[33]

and further:

> I believe that people can change organizations and society . . . . Prescriptively, I would thus like us all to recognize that reality is made, not given; to recognize that our seeing and understanding of the world is always *seeing as*, rather than a *seeing as is* and to take an ethical and moral responsibility for the personal and collective consequences of the way we see and act in everyday life, difficult though this may be . . . . Consistent with my overall orientation, I firmly believe that we need to break the hold of bureaucratic thinking and to move toward newer, less exploitative, more equal modes of interaction in organizations.[34]

We suggest that the clues to a Y^1 organizational structure are already surrounding us, ready to be noticed. One starting point to provoke noticing is to play a game of 'antithesis'. What would be the opposite of the basic requisites of bureaucracy? Rather than a hierarchy, imagine a heterarchy; rather than appointed leaders, elected leaders;

rather than centralized power, diffused responsibility; rather than system goals, individual goals; generality rather than specialization; variative job definition rather than specification; permeable boundaries of responsibility rather than circumscription of responsibility; ex post facto rather than a priori expectations of satisfactory performance.

The game can be extended if one turns from antithesis to invention. What needs to be done structurally to fit the characteristics of Argyris' mature individual and McGregor's Theory Y? We need to create conditions that allow for self-direction and self-control. For example, as a prior condition the organization's goals must be derived from the goals of the individual or, better yet, be discovered in the successes of the individual. The reward system must be rooted in the intrinsic rewards of the individual's job. Empire builders must be encouraged to seek added responsibility in the organization because responsibility is not a finite element in the organization. The conditions of discovery are such that new ideas, images, creative solutions and, of course, problems emerge from the people of the organization. Ideas from any are treated as ideas from the influential. Individual employees can run trials of new ideas or techniques in the same manner that organizations now arrange trials. Workers develop intricate human, technical and conceptual linkages to the organization — the kind of linkages that suggest to managers in current organizations that 'this place will probably collapse without me.' The contract between the individual and the organization feels like the intimate life-time employment described by William Ouchi as characteristic of Japanese organizations.[35] While referring to Theory Z, one could also consider non-specialized career paths, slow evaluation, decoupled formal titles and actual responsibility, and membership in multiple work groups.

Non-bureaucratic (Y^1) structural alternatives are neither recondite nor beyond our contemporary experience. If we look about us we see clues to Y^1 in the practice and theory of today, e.g.:

> operating sub-units within current organizations that function successfully with a non-bureaucratic structural form, for example, R&D centers or teams, some university departments, self-managing work teams in industrial settings;
>
> organizations in other cultural settings that exhibit non-bureaucratic features, e.g., Theory Z, and the adaptation of some of these features in American organizations;
>
> non-work organizations that function effectively employing counter-bureaucratic structures, e.g., voluntary service groups;
>
> clan-like organizations that arise, at least occasionally, in the midst of or parallel to a bureaucratic structure, e.g., alternative schools and private schools;
>
> professional organizations that are better depicted as organic or coalitional than bureaucratic;[36]
>
> administrative techniques and strategies that struggle to survive in bureaucratic settings (and for which we struggle to offer bureaucratic rationalizations) although the strategies are clearly anti-bureaucratic in intent, e.g., self- and peer-evaluation, election of leaders, empowerment, job enlargement, team building;

25 ·2

> metaphors that suggest richer interpretations of everyday life in organizations than the classical machine and military metaphors;
>
> theoretical formulations that, though anti-bureaucratic, seem to conform better to the practitioner's understanding of logic-in-use than does traditional reconstructed logic about organizations;
>
> theoretical and empirical anomalies that suggest the existing structural orientation is flawed, e.g., evidence that modal behavior in organizations is represented better by a theory in which action precedes intent; rationality is retrospective rather than prospective; individual and organizational choices do not conform to consistent preferences.

These glimpses of alternatives to the bureaucratic structure are overwhelmed not by the practicalness of the bureaucratic model but by its omnipresence. Tradition and availability are often confused with practicability. How can one imagine operable alternatives to a structure so firmly in place? That is our dilemma, our challenge, our hope.

Conjoining Assumptions about Person and Structure in Organizations

Figure 1 displays the territory covered to this point in the chapter. Cell one represents modal practice in organizations today. Operationally, most organizational participants cling to a Theory X view of people. That view dominates our day-to-day life in organizations. This view is not restricted to administrators; teachers ordinarily express similar views of other teachers, administrators and their students. Organizational story telling by teachers and administrators abounds with tales of incompetence, laziness, inconsiderable behavior and intolerable domination.

However deeply alternative views of people have penetrated the literature of organizational theory, they have barely made a dent in the interactions of persons in organizations — including schools. And why should they? The structure that surrounds us in our work organizations demonstrates the basic wisdom of Theory X. We feel compelled to supervise, control, motivate teachers. That is consistent with a fear that without these organizational practices teachers will be unmotivated, indolent, uncertain of their job requirements and unclear about organizational goals. Do we address similar concern to the lack of motivation of the superintendent of schools or to the likelihood that s/he will be unclear about the district's goals or her/his own job requirements? Are slothfulness and confusion human characteristics determined by the scalar principle? Of course they are not. However, the bureaucratic structure has always assumed that the natural tendency of all people to behave in ways antithetical to the best interests of the organization can only be controlled through domination. When our back is up against the wall to demonstrate school reform, we attempt to mandate higher standards and levels of performance; control and accountability mechanisms — tests, merit pay, standards, competitive comparisons — are the first tools to which we turn.

A Theory X view of people is in harmony with a traditional view of organizational structure. On most days of the year that harmony is expressed in our schools. But

Assumptions about Structure

Assumptions about People	Theory X^1	Theory Y^1
Theory X	$X\text{-}X^1$ – conventional assumptions about persons and structure – *modal view in contemporary organizational practice* (1)	$X\text{-}Y^1$ – adoption of structural modifications to relieve pressures on the bureaucratic structure – symbolic response; in some ways an *empty set* (2)
Theory Y	$Y\text{-}X^1$ – neo-orthodox response to 'humanizing' the organization – *modal view in current organizational theory; emergent view in organizational practice* (3)	$Y\text{-}Y^1$ – non-orthodox response to 'humanizing' the organization – *emergent view in organizational theory* (4)

Figure 1. A Classificatory Schema of the Interaction between Assumptions about Person and Structure in Organizations

something pulls away at our commitment to the traditional structure. The popularity of specific devices (quality circles, peer evaluation, career ladders, matrix organization, conflict resolution techniques) and more general strategies (empowerment, job enlargement, strategic planning, school site management, Theory Z, shared decision-making) demonstrate an uneasiness and disaffection with $X\text{-}X^1$ organizations on either the basis of human concerns or organizational productivity or both. In some cases modification is simply a response to pressure brought to bear on the hierarchy by individuals chafing under the restrictiveness of a bureaucratic structure or clients dissatisfied with the product or services of the organization. Often the adjustment is only the attempt of opportunistic managers to modify structure while clinging to traditional

views of persons in the organization — an X-Y[1] position in Figure 1, cell two. It is even reasonable to argue that cell two, by its nature, is an empty set because the adoption of structural variations, tactical or strategic, to enhance the effectiveness of ultimate control over individuals in the organization is unlikely to represent any modification in the adopter's assumptions about the necessary elements of structural control.

In contrast, cell three is where most of us end up after we have decided to do our best to think about or work toward 'humanizing' an organization. The decision to operate on the basis of Theory Y within the constraints of a traditional organizational structure produces results that are well meant but essentially inconsonant. Seven years after publishing his seminal theoretical book on the individual and the organization, Chris Argyris undertook the task of theoretically integrating the individual and the organization. In a prophetic first chapter Argyris asked whether it is likely that the relationships between the individual and the organization can be maximized. He answered his own question by suggesting that the best that can be hoped for is to reduce the conflict in the relationships between the two, a kind of 'satisficing' rather than maximizing the relationship.

Argyris' position in Figure 1 was clearly in cell three. He noted:

> We believe that organizations and personalities are discrete units with their own laws, which make them amenable to study as separate units. However, we also believe that important parts of each unit's existence depend on their connectedness with the other . . . Our primary interest is at the boundaries of both — at the points where they overlap and are interrelated.[37]

Further, Argyris' definition of what he called the 'underlying nature' of formal organizations was traditional:

> Formal organizations are based on certain principles such as 'task specialization', 'chain of command', 'unity of direction', 'rationality', and others. These are the basic 'genes' that are supported by, and at times modified in, varying degrees by the technology, the kinds of managerial controls, and the patterns of leadership used in the organization.[38]

Confronting this oxymoronic situation, how did Argyris imagine 'the organization of the future?' First, he did not imagine revolutionary structural alterations: 'One conclusion, however, should be evident by now. The pyramidal structure has *not* been overthrown. It has simply been relegated to a more realistic position in terms of its potential.'[39] But he did predict changes that have continued to be discussed and implemented over the past twenty years, e.g.:

> Management in the organization of the future will give much more thought to its basic values and planning as to how they may be implemented . . .
>
> The values about effective organizational relationships will be expanded and deepened . . .
>
> The concept of directive authority or power will be expanded to include the influence of individuals through rewards and penalties that minimize

> dependence, through internal commitment, and the process of confirmation. The 'old' values regarding influence will still be maintained to be used for the appropriate conditions. The 'new' values regarding influence will be added to, not substituted for, the old . . .
>
> The organization of the future will strive to enlarge the jobs . . .
>
> Individuals [will be required] to become concerned for the health of the organization . . . Thus employees (at all levels) may meet in small groups to constantly diagnose organizational strengths and weaknesses . . .
>
> The pyramidal structure will now exist side by side with several other structures . . .
>
> Participants [other than designated leaders] will . . . be required to accept increasing amounts of responsibility and therefore authority . . .
>
> As trust increases the climate should tend to be ripe for some major changes in the controls, reward and penalty, and incentive systems . . . Controls will change to instruments of opportunity for increased self-responsibility and psychological success . . . The information collected 'on' an individual will be collected 'by' him and evaluated by him, and he will take the appropriate action . . .
>
> Rewards and penalties, therefore, will also tend to be modified. There will still be the more traditional rewards and penalties, especially to the degree that (1) the foregoing changes are not possible, (2) the people's physiological and security needs are not fulfilled, (3) the individuals are psychologically threatened by growth and self-responsibility.[40]

Cell three is simultaneously comfortable and stressful. The position takes the individual in the organization into account at more than a superficial level. The traditional structure is adjusted to fit individual needs. Argyris was picturing job enlargement, quality circles, diffused leadership, self-evaluation, matrix organization, strategic planning, opportunities for intrinsic job rewards. That is more than alright for 1964; but what stopped him cold was the question of 'by whose leave'. The answer is by the authority vested in appointed officials in a bureaucratic system. The adaptations are dependent on the goodwill or the good intelligence or both of designated leaders. Argyris' position, then and now, is neither cynical nor manipulative. But it is strained. The fact is cell three accepts an impractical theoretical position, one that argues simultaneously for freedom with responsibility in a democratic system and control with benevolence in an oligarchic structure. We need to return to Presthus' conjecture. Why it is that 'the logic of freedom which is so compelling in this public context is often neglected where private power is concerned.'[41]

Cell four is the alternative. We must create and experiment with structures that fit the accumulated theory and research about the human personality. We must not be constrained by the traditional structural assumptions that were derived from an incomplete and inaccurate understanding of human potential. In the following section we will try to imagine a new school organization based on $Y-Y^1$ assumptions.

Reflections on a Democratic Structure for Leadership in New Schools

We know how to start the process of imagining such a new school because we know what we need in a work organization — and that others need the same basic ingredients — to be free, to be valued, to be challenged, to grow, to assume responsibility, to be secure, to be rewarded, to be in touch with our own true selves. We know such an organization is possible, that it is within our own power to create and implement if we choose to do so. We are convinced that we must move in the direction of organizations for people if we aspire to excellence in performance and freedom for human beings.

Initially we want to assert a small number of propositions that we feel are imperative in imagining a new school:

1 *A new school must be built on the assumption of the consent of the governed.*

This concept is troublesome chiefly because it is strange. But, if any organization should reflect our democratic ideals, it is the school. Designated leaders, e.g., the principal, should be chosen by teachers. The professional staff of the school unit should choose their new colleagues. The professional staff is a work team of mature adults. They cannot manifest professional responsibility in an oligarchy.

2 *A new school must be built on shared authority and responsibility not delegation of authority and responsibility.*

The responsibility for a new school lies with the professional staff of the school, not solely or even predominantly with a designated leader. If the new school is a team enterprise, then the key actors on the team change from day to day and activity to activity. If there is to be delegation of authority, it must come from the team to the individual. If specialists in subject areas, or curriculum, or administration are to take on special spheres of responsibility, that assignment must be made by the staff of the school.

3 *The staff of a new school must trade assignments and work in multiple groups to remain in touch with the school as a whole.*

The role of principal or headteacher or chair should be assumed ordinarily for relatively short periods. The staff should include many individuals whose experience includes terms of work in administration and instructional development as well as classroom teaching. The work groups formed within the staff should provide opportunities to interact with a variety of colleagues on a variety of problems.

4 *Formal rewards to the staff, i.e., salary, tenure, forms of promotion, should be under the control of the staff of the new school as a whole.*

There is no perfectly satisfactory way to distribute differential rewards. But *no one* is in the better position to deal with this difficult issue than a collegial group. Peer evaluation and decision-making may end in the decision to reduce individual distinctions and emphasize group distinctions. It may not. In either event the power tools of formal rewards and recognition must not be controlled by an individual outside the group. The problem is a professional issue of self-determination.

5 *The goals of the new school must be formulated by and agreed to through group consensus. The professional staff is responsible for negotiating the acceptability of the goals to the school community.*

Although formal goals probably have little to do with organizational efficacy, the school needs to represent itself to its political constituency and clarify, for itself, its raison d'être. The school *is* the professional staff, acting both individually and collectively. The staff is responsible for negotiating the relationship of individual goals to the goals of the school as an organization, translating those into programs, and subsequently expressing the goals and programs to other responsible agents and agencies in an intelligible and acceptable form.

We are going to stop with this short list of 'musts'. They represent sufficiently the basic change in orientation that we feel is necessary to the 'new school'. If they were implemented, schools would be operating on the basis of:

democracy;
group authority and accountability;
variability, generality and interactivity in work assignment;
self-descipline and control exercised individually and collectively;
group commitment to and consensus about organizational goals and means

We are certain of one thing. We will never move within the bureaucratic structure to new schools, to free schools. That structure was invented to assure domination and control. It will never produce freedom and self-actualization. We cannot get there from here. The risk of movement from here to there is not great. The bureaucratic structure is failing in a manner so critical that adaptations will not forestall its collapse. It is impractical. It does not fit the psychological and personal needs of the workforce.

An alternative structure can be argued as practical on grounds of organizational productivity. Research evidence on creativity and innovation supports organizational structures that promote freedom, self-control and personal development. Organizational studies indicate that such non-bureaucratic characteristics as activity, variability, self-efficacy, empowerment and disaggregation are more likely to be found in effective organizations than their bureaucratic counterparts — stability, regularity, accountability, control and centralization. In the replacement of the bureaucratic structure, necessity may turn out to be the progenitor of practicality. From our viewpoint only one argument is needed to sustain the change. An oligarchic work organization is discordant in a free society. Persons need and deserve the same degree of protection of their human rights in the workplace that is assured in their broader role as adult citizens.

Finally, we counsel patience in the development of and experimentation with new organizational forms. We have been patient and forgiving of our extant form. Remember that new forms will also be ideal forms. Do not press them immediately to their point of absurdity. Bureaucracy as an ideal form became tempered by adjectival distinctions — bounded, contingent, situational. New forms need to be granted the same exceptions as they are proposed and tested. No one seriously imagines a utopian alternative to bureaucracy. But realistic alternatives can be formed that consistently trade off control for freedom, the organization for the individual; and they can be built upon the principle of the consent of the governed.

Notes

1 Walker Percy, *The Thanatos Syndrome* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1987), p. 16.
2 *Ibid.*, pp. 16–17.
3 H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 215.
4 *Ibid.*, pp. 215–16.
5 *Ibid.*, pp. 200–1.
6 *Ibid.*, p. 228.
7 Ibid., p. 214.
8 Chester I. Barnard, *The Functions of the Executive* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 12.
9 Robert Presthus, *The Organizational Society* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), pp. 93–134; Douglas McGregor, *The Human Side of Enterprise* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1985), pp. 33–58; Chris Argyris, *Personality and Organization* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), pp. 20–53.
10 McGregor, *op. cit.*, pp. 33–4.
11 *Ibid.*, p. 34.
12 *Ibid.*, pp. 47–8.
13 *Ibid.*, p. 48.
14 Argyris, *op. cit.*, p. 49.
15 *Ibid.*, pp. 49–50.
16 *Ibid.*, p. 53.
17 *Ibid.*, p. 75.
18 Presthus, *op. cit.*, pp. 119–20.
19 *Ibid.*, p. 19.
20 Gerth and Mills, *op. cit.*, p. 200.
21 *Ibid.*
22 *Ibid.*, p. 241.
23 McGregor, *op. cit.*, p. 49.
24 *Ibid.*, p. 9.
25 *Ibid.*, pp. 185–8.
26 Rosabeth M. Kanter, *The Change Masters* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983), pp. 171–2.
27 Jerry L. Patterson, Stewart C. Purkey and Jackson V. Parker, *Productive School Systems for a Nonrational World* (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), p. 27.
28 Michael D. Cohen and James G. March, *Leadership and Ambiguity* (Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1986), p. 3.
29 *Ibid.*
30 *Ibid.*
31 'Unjustified variation, as opposed to rational variation, is emphasized in evolutionary theory . . . An unjustified variation is one for which truth has not been established, but one for which truth is not precluded.' Karl E. Weick, *The Social Psychology of Organizing* (New York: Random House, 1979), p. 123.
32 William Foster, *Paradigms and Promises: New Approaches to Educational Administration* (Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1986), p. 189.
33 Gareth Morgan, *Images of Organization* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1986), p. 343.
34 *Ibid.*, pp. 382–3.
35 William G. Ouchi, *Theory Z* (New York: Avon Books, 1982), pp. 15–22.
36 James D. Thompson, *Organizations in Action* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), pp. 142–3.

37 Chris Argyris, *Integrating the Individual and the Organization* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964), p. 13.
38 *Ibid.*, p. 14.
39 *Ibid.*, p. 272.
40 *Ibid.*, pp. 273–6.
41 Presthus, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

Chapter 2

Teacher Professionalism: Why and How?

Linda Darling-Hammond

Discussions about teacher professionalism often center on issues of money, status, autonomy and respect for teachers. These are all important matters at a time when recruitment of talented individuals to teaching is more difficult, but they are not the primary reasons for pursuing teacher professionalism. The major reason for seeking to create a profession of teaching is that it will increase the probability that students will be well educated. Indeed, the most pressing problems of public education today — student failure, dropouts, school vandalism, anomie, lack of acquisition of critical thinking skills, the flight to private schools — require as part of their solution the increased professionalization of teaching.

Professionalism depends not on compensation or status, but on the affirmation of three principles in the conduct and governance of an occupation:

1 Knowledge is the basis for permission to practise and for decisions that are made with respect to the unique needs of clients;
2 The practitioner pledges his first concern to the welfare of the clients;
3 The profession assumes collective responsibility for the definition, transmittal and enforcement of professional standards of practice and ethics.

These principles outline a view of practice that is *client-oriented* and *knowledge-based*. This view also suggests criteria and methods for accountability that are based on the competence of practitioners and their effectiveness. Currently the practice of teaching in public schools is not organized to support these principles or modes of accountability. Instead, the bureaucratic organization of schooling and teaching requires practice that is procedure-oriented and rule-based. It enforces accountability based on the job scripts of practitioners and their compliance with task specifications. The individual needs of students are difficult to accommodate in this system. The growth of knowledge in the occupation is difficult to support and sustain.

This chapter seeks to describe the goals and requirements of a professional system of teaching. It discusses how schools must be restructured to support professional accountability and how parent, public and professional control can be reconciled in a system that focuses on the needs of students.

Why Pursue Teacher Professionalism?

The basic problem in public education today is finding a way to meet the diverse needs of students who come to school with varying capabilities, learning styles, psychological predispositions, family situations and beliefs about themselves and about what school means for them. Recent concerns about 'at-risk' youth — those who drop out, tune out, become pregnant, fall behind — converge with major changes in the home backgrounds of students: more children live in poverty, with one or no parents, in divorced or reconstituted families than ever before in recent history.

At the same time we expect more of schools and teachers than ever before. We expect students to be not just minimally trained but well educated. Our changing economy requires that we produce 'knowledge workers' in large numbers: America's movement to a post-industrial, technological and information economy will require a highly skilled, analytically trained and creative workforce to sustain technological growth as low-skill manufacturing jobs continue to move overseas (Carnegie Forum, 1986).

These goals and challenges require that schools develop the capacity to meet students needs and society's demands in a way that they have not before been asked to do. Schools process students through courses, grades and programs in a fashion that assumes that exposure to the treatment will accomplish the objectives of education. As John Dewey characterized the 'old education', defined by these course, curriculum, grading and grouping requirements:

> There is next to no opportunity for adjustment to varying capacities and demands. There is a certain amount — a fixed quantity — of ready-made results and accomplishments to be acquired by all children alike in a given time. It is in response to this demand that the curriculum has been developed from the elementary school up through the college. There is just so much desirable knowledge, and there are just so many needed technical accomplishments in the world. Then comes the mathematical problem of dividing this by the six, twelve, or sixteen years of school life. Now give the children every year just the proportionate fraction of the total, and by the time they have finished they will have mastered the whole. By covering so much ground during this hour or day or week or year, everything comes out with perfect evenness at the end — provided the children have not forgotten what they have previously learned. (Dewey, 1900, pp. 33–4)

What Dewey called the 'old education' is a view of education derived from a factory model of organization in which students are raw materials subjected to uniform schooling processes. He and other progressives at the turn of the century sought to replace this approach — 'its passivity of attitude, its mechanical massing of children, its uniformity of curriculum and method' (Dewey, 1900, p. 34) — with a child-centered approach that focuses on the needs and aptitudes of students. These two opposing views of the purposes and methods of education have remained in conflict ever since, and are at the root of educational reform debates today, including, especially, debates over the necessity and form of teacher professionalism.

The criticisms of current educational reformers — that our schools provide most

children with an education that is too rigid, too passive, too rote-oriented to produce learners who can think critically, synthesize and transform, experiment and create — are virtually identical to those of the progressives at the turn of the century. Indeed, with the addition of a few computers, the Carnegie Forum's (1986) scenario for a twenty-first century school is essentially the same as John Dewey's (1900) account of the twentieth century ideal.

Then, as now, the notion was advanced that the provision of universal high-quality education is linked to the professionalization of teaching. But these earlier attempts at reform failed to take hold in any substantial way. Cremin (1965) argues that 'progressive education demanded infinitely skilled teachers, and it failed because such teachers could not be recruited in sufficient numbers.' Because of this failure, in each of its iterations progressivism gave to standardizing influences, in the efficiency movement of the 1920's the teacher-proof curricular reforms of the 1950s and the 'back to the basics' movement of the 1970s. Disappointment with the outcomes of these attempts at rationalizing school procedures led in turn to renewed criticisms of schools and efforts to restructure them.

The crux of the issue is whether the beliefs and strategies that shape schools will rely on a bureaucratic approach to teaching or a professional approach. These approaches start from two entirely different views of the purposes of education, the nature of learning, the characteristics of learners and the requirements for effective teaching. Below we explore these differences.

The Bureaucratic Approach to Teaching

The logic of school structure described by Dewey, which is still more pronounced today, results from a view of education and learning which is conducive to the bureaucratic organization and management of schools. This view is as follows. Schools are agents of government that can be administered by hierarchical decision-making and controls. Policies are made at the top of the system and handed down to administrators who translate them into rules and procedures. Teachers follow the rules and procedures (class schedules, curricula, textbooks, rules for promotion and assignment of students, etc.), and students are processed according to them.

The basic assumptions underlying this view are that:

> students are sufficiently standardized that they will respond in identical and predictable ways to the 'treatments' devised by policy-makers and their principal agents;
>
> sufficient knowledge of which treatments should be prescribed is both available and generalizable to all educational circumstances;
>
> this knowledge can be translated into standardized rules for practice; these can be operationalized through regulations and reporting and inspection systems; and
>
> administrators and teachers can and will faithfully implement the prescriptions for practice thus devised and transmitted to schools.

The circular bottom-line assumption is that this process, if efficiently administered, will produce the outcomes that the system desires. If the outcomes are not satisfactory, the final assumption is that the prescriptions are not yet sufficiently detailed or the process of implementation is not sufficiently exact. Thus the solutions to educational problems always lie in more precise regulation of educational or management processes.

This logic has been extended to its furthest reach in the school policies of the last fifteen years. Since the early 1970s, state governments have exerted more and more control over the form, substance and conduct of schooling. Centralized textbook adoption, mandated curriculum guides for each grade level and subject area, rules governing when children must start school and how they will be tracked into programs and promoted from grade to grade, use of minimum competency tests and other standardized assessments to define teaching and determine student placements, and rationalized management schemes — such as performance-based budgeting systems, management by objectives, and competency-based education — are policies that have gained widespread currency. In addition to the assumptions described above, these policies assume that state legislators and bureaucrats know better than local school administrators, teachers or parents what the goals of education ought to be and how they can be realized. In this sense the policies embody state-oriented rather than client-oriented control of education.

State governments did not invent this view. They are merely adopting at higher level in the governance system what was begun and developed in large urban school systems in the early part of this century (Wise, 1979). Indeed, New York City was at the forefront of city school systems that adopted bureaucratically administered 'scientific management' principles as a means for bringing order to school operations. These principles were outlined in 1913 by Franklin Bobbitt, advising on 'The Supervision of City Schools':

> Principle I. Definite qualitative and quantitative standards must be determined for the product (i.e. student).
>
> Principle II. Where the material that is acted upon by the labor processes passes through a number of progressive stages on its way from the raw material to the ultimate product, definite qualitative and quantitative standards must be determined for the product at each of these stages (i.e. grade levels).
>
> Principle III. Scientific Management finds the methods of procedure which are most efficient for actual service under actual conditions, and secures their use on the part of workers (i.e. teachers).
>
> Principle IV. Standard qualifications must be determined for the workers.
>
> Principle V. The management must train its workers previous to service in the measure demand by its standard qualifications.
>
> Principle VI. The worker must be kept up to standard qualifications for his kind of work for his entire service.
>
> Principle VII. The worker must be kept supplied with detailed instructions as to the work to be done, the standards to be reached, the methods to be employed, and the appliances to be used. (Bobbitt, 1913, quoted in Wise, 1979, pp. 83–4)

It is easy to see how this depiction of management by product, job and task specifications fits with bureaucratic organizational structures and goals: the specialization of functions, rationalization of activities and creation of routines to guide task performance. The ultimate goal of bureaucratization is to remove considerations of persons from the conduct of the work. As Weber put it: 'Bureaucracy . . . develops the more perfectly, the more (it) is dehumanized' (Gerth and Mills, 1958, p. 215).

Ted Sizer (1984) has described how the increased centralization and bureaucratization of education, adopted in the name of 'scientific management', dehumanize education and constrain what is possible in schools. First, the system of pyramidal governance

> forces us in large measure to overlook special local conditions, particularly school-by-school differences . . . While central authorities almost always try to provide local options and 'consultation', the framework of school remains permanently fixed. This framework includes the organization of schools by students' ages, by similar subject departments, by time blocks, by specialized job descriptions, by calendar, and in many states, by precise forms of staff contracts and licenses.

Within this framework much that fundamentally defines the process of education is predetermined. Changes within the framework can only be marginal.

Second, 'bureaucracy depends on the specific, the measurable . . . . [T]hose aspects of schoolkeeping which can be readily quantified often become the only forms of representation. The endless and exclusive talk of attendance rates, dropout rates, test scores, suspension rates . . . reminds one of Vietnam War body counts'.

Third,

> large administrative units depend on norms, the bases of predictability. Inevitably, a central tendency becomes the rigid expectation. In September, a sixteen-year-old will be an eleventh grader, and eleventh-graders will score in certain ways on certain tests. The fact that a group of sixteen-year-olds, all of whom can ultimately master the material on those tests, shows a wide spread in scores of achievement and aptitude on any given day is usually overlooked . . . . Insisting on strict norms — which hierarchical bureaucracies require in order to function — is wasteful and unfair.

Fourth, 'centralized planning requires a high level of specificity.' This translates into specialized job descriptions for adults in schools, each of whom is responsible only for certain specific tasks and not others. From the student's point of view this means that there are a number of adults who know a bit about him, but none who sees him as a whole. From the school's point of view this means that learning must be carved up into small pieces and allocated across slots in the day or week to teachers whose job it is to perform the specified tasks, whether useful or not. From the teacher's point of view, this means that the needs of students — and alternate ways of serving those needs — must be subordinated to the demands of the tasks and slots.

Fifth, 'bureaucracies lumber. Once regulations, collective bargaining agreements, and licensure get installed, change comes hard. Every regulation, agreement, and license spawns a lobby dedicated to keeping it in place. The larger and more complex the

hierarchy, the more powerful the lobby becomes, even more remote from frustrated classroom teachers, poorly served students, and angry parents. Indeed, this feature of bureaucracy decreases accountability. Ironically, prescriptive policies created in the name of public accountability ultimately reduce schools' responsiveness to the needs of students and the desires of parents. Faceless regulations become the scapegoats for school failure, since no person in the system takes responsibility for their effects on kids.

Finally, 'hierarchical bureaucracy stifles initiative at its base.' Or, as the Carnegie Forum put it, 'everyone has the brakes and no one has the motors to make the schools run.' Sizer concludes: 'It is astonishing that so few critics challenge the system. In an absolute sense, the learning exhibited by even a 'successful' student after over twelve thousand hours in classrooms is strikingly limited. When one considers the energy, commitment, and quality of so many of the people working in the schools, one must place the blame elsewhere. The people are better than the structure. Therefore the stucture must be at fault.' In the final analysis perfected bureaucracy with its emphasis on developing rules 'without regard to persons' is intrinsically unsuited to the task of educating human beings.

For all of the laudable goals of bureaucracy — equal and uniform treatment of clients, standardization of products or services, prevention of arbitrary or capricious decision-making — it lacks the tools to manage complex work, to handle the unpredictable or to meet distinctive needs of clients. By its very nature bureaucratic management is incapable of providing appropriate education for students who do not fit the mold upon which all of the prescriptions for practice are based. As inputs, processes and measures of outcomes are increasingly prescribed and standardized, the cracks into which students can fall grow larger rather than smaller. This is because the likelihood that each of the accumulated prescriptions is suitable for a given child grows smaller with each successive limitation upon teachers' ability to adapt instruction to the students' needs.

The problem with the bureaucratic solution is that effective teaching is not routine, students are not passive and questions of practice are not simple, predictable or standardized. Consequently, instructional decisions cannot be formulated on high, then packaged and handed down to teachers. Nor can instructional problems be solved by occasional forays into the classroom by inspectors who monitor performance or dispense advice without intimate knowledge of the classroom context, the subject matter being taught, the goals of instruction, the stages of development of individual children and the social structure of the class or school as a whole. We have pushed the bureaucratic model of educational improvement as far as it can go, and it does not go far enough.

Bureaucratization and Teaching

In the bureaucratic model teachers are viewed as bureaucratic functionaries rather than well trained and highly skilled professionals. Little investment is made in teaching preparation, induction or professional development. Little credence is given to licensing or knowledge acquisition. Little time is afforded for joint planning or collegial consultation about problems of practice. Because practices are prescribed outside the school setting, there is no need and little use for professional knowledge and judgment. Thus novice

teachers assume the same responsibilities as thirty-year veterans. Separated by egg-crate classrooms and packed teaching schedules, teachers rarely work or talk together about teaching practices. A rationale for these activities is absent from the bureaucratic perspective on teaching work.

In the bureaucratic conception of teaching, teachers do not need to be highly knowledgeable about learning theory and pedagogy, cognitive science and child development, curriculum and assessment; they do not need to be highly skilled, because they do not, presumably, make the major decisions about these matters. Curriculum planning is done by administrators and specialists; teachers are to implement a curriculum planned for them. Inspection of teachers' work is conducted by superiors whose job it is to make sure that the teacher is implementing the curriculum and procedures of the district. Teachers do not plan or evaluate their own work; they merely perform it.

Accountability is achieved by inspections and reporting systems intended to ensure that the rules and procedures are being followed. Teachers are held accountable for implementing curricular and testing policies, assignment and promotion rules, and myriad other educational prescriptions, whether or not these 'treatments' are appropriate in particular instances for particular students. As a consequence, teachers cannot be held professionally accountable — that is, responsible for meeting the needs of their students; they can only be held accountable for following standard operating procedures. The standard for accountability is compliance rather than effectiveness.

Indeed, the very definition of 'professionalism' in teaching has been turned on its head in public schools. Rather than connoting a high level of training and knowledge applied to practice that must, above all else, serve the needs of clients in intellectually honest ways, the term is used by most policy-makers and administrators to mean an unquestioning compliance with agency directives. Evaluation criteria stress good soldiership and conformity with district policies rather than knowledgeable advocacy of appropriate teaching practices. The 'professional' teacher in common parlance is one who 'does things right' rather than one who 'does the right things'.

Teachers who feel the tug of professional accountability describe in graphic terms the ethical struggles they experience when asked to conform to policies and procedures that they know to be educationally counterproductive, at times even damaging to their students. Those who know the most about good teaching and who care most deeply about their students are most apt to say they will leave the profession if teaching content and methods are further regulated (Darling-Hammond and Wise, 1985). These teachers find it anti-professional to focus on rules and reporting systems rather than on their students:

> The only thing that would make me leave teaching is if they ever computerize all these objectives and I have to sit there and check off forms for 38 kids and 250 different objectives. I think if it got down to that, I would simply resign because I would feel like I was spending more time on forms than on kids.

Or, as another teacher put it:

> I feel sorry for any teacher who is interested in teaching. It is going to be much worse in the years to come. For those who like the record keeping, and there are plenty of them — pathetic teachers but great record keepers — this will be a

> way of moving them up the ladder. It won't help the good teachers. It will help the people who teach by the book, because it is safe and it doesn't require any imagination. (Darling-Hammond and Wise, 1985, p. 331)

We can no longer pretend that one best system will be found that can be codified and packaged for rote administration by teachers. We now know that effective teaching techniques vary for students with different learning styles, at different stages of cognitive and psychological development, for different subject areas and for different instructional goals. We know that students will differ in their approaches to learning. Consequently, we can no longer pretend that it is sufficient to treat students as raw materials and teachers as factory workers. If students are to be well taught, it will not be by virtue of bureaucratic mandate, but by virtue of highly trained, well supported professionals who can use their knowledge and judgment to make sound decisions appropriate to the unique needs of children.

Unfortunately, the educational system does not encourage the development of such knowledge on the part of teachers. Teacher education is typically short and often characterized by a cookbook approach to the acquisition of teaching techniques; induction into the profession is virtually non-existent — new teachers are left to sink or swim when they enter the classroom. It is difficult for teachers to learn from their colleagues when no provision is made in the structure of schools for collegial sharing or decision-making. Indeed, the notion that teaching knowledge is largely irrelevant is reaffirmed whenever teacher shortages are met with emergency and alternative certification procedures that confirm the unimportance of pedagogical knowledge for teachers.

Professionalism proposes an alternative to the current approach to managing teaching. It suggests a more client-oriented and accountable method for structuring schools and teaching.

What is Teacher Professionalism?

Professionalization is not a dichotomous event or a state of grace into which an occupation clearly falls or does not. Rather, it describes points along a continuum representing the extent to which members of an occupation share a common body of knowledge and use shared standards of practice in exercising that knowledge on behalf of clients. It incorporates conditions of specialized knowledge, collective self-regulation, special attention to the unique needs of clients, autonomous performance and a large dose of responsibility for client welfare.

Professionals are obligated to do whatever is best for the client, not what is easiest, most expedient or even what the client him/herself might want. They are also obligated to base a decision about what is best for the client on available knowledge — not just that knowledge acquired from personal experience but also that clinical and research knowledge acquired by the occupation as a whole and represented in professional journals, certification standards and specialty training. Finally, professionals are required to take into account the unique needs of individual clients in fashioning their judgments about what strategies or treatments are appropriate.

These are fine goals, but how are they operationalized to result in something that might be called professional accountability? In policy terms these requirements suggest

greater regulation of *teachers* — ensuring their competence through more rigorous preparation, certification, selection, evaluation — in exchange for the deregulation of *teaching* — fewer rules prescribing what is to be taught, when, how. This is, in essence, the bargain that all professions make with society: for occupations that require discretion and judgment in meeting the unique needs of clients, the profession guarantees the competence of members in exchange for the privilege of professional control over work structure and standards of practice.

The theory behind this equation is that professional control improves both the quality of individual services and the level of knowledge in the profession as a whole. This occurs because decision-making by well trained professionals allows individual clients' needs to be met more precisely, and it promotes continual refinement and improvement in overall practice as 'effectiveness' rather than 'compliance' becomes the standard for judging competence.

It is important to note, too, that professional authority does not mean legitimizing the idiosyncratic or whimsical preferences of individual classroom teachers. Many parties to the professionalism debate seem to suggest that increased teacher authority and autonomy are the major goals of this course of action. The thought is that by giving individual teachers more freedom, they will be empowered to do what is best for students. This simple construction, however, is dangerous and one-sided. It does not adequately answer the obvious question, 'What if more authoritative and autonomous teachers do not do what is best for students?' Having weakened other alternative sources of authority, how will we ensure that students' needs are given voice and their interests are served?

Indeed, in other public service occupations autonomy is the problem that professionalism is meant to address. It is precisely *because* practitioners operate autonomously that safeguards to protect the public interest are necessary. In occupations that have become professionalized these safeguards have taken the form of screens to membership in the profession and ongoing peer review of practice. Collective autonomy from external regulation is achieved by the assumption of collective responsibility through self-governance (Darling-Hammond, 1986). Responsible self-governance requires, in turn, structures and vehicles by which the profession can define and transmit its knowledge base, control membership in the occupation, evaluate and refine its practices and enforce norms of ethical practice. This requires major changes in the structure of teaching both inside and outside schools.

Changes Needed to Promote Teacher Professionalism

As the above discussion indicates, teacher professionalism requires changes in both the policies that define the teaching occupation and the ways in which schools are organized for teaching. These changes fall into three main categories: (1) policies governing entry and continuation in the profession; (2) policies and practices defining what teachers do in schools and classrooms; and (3) policies governing how — and by whom — decisions about professional membership and teaching practices are made.

The goals of professionalizing policies are to protect the public by ensuring that: (1) all individuals permitted to practise in certain capacities are adequately prepared to do

so responsibly; (2) where certainty about practice does not exist, practitioners will, individually and collectively, continually seek to discover the most responsible course of action; and (3) as the first two points suggest, practitioners will pledge their first and primary commitment to the welfare of the client.

Preparation for Responsible Practice

The first of the goals listed above — that *all* individuals permitted to practise are adequately prepared — is crucial to attaining the conditions for and benefits of professionalism. So long as anyone who is not fully prepared is admitted to an occupation where autonomous practice can jeopardize the safety of clients, the public's trust is violated. So long as no floor is enforced on the level of knowledge needed to teach, a professional culture in schools cannot long be maintained, for some practitioners will be granted control and autonomy who are not prepared to exercise it responsibly.

Teacher Education

Professionalism starts from the proposition that knowledge must inform practice, yet teacher education is often denounced and even avoided on the grounds that either it does not convey the knowledge necessary for real teaching (some argue this must be acquired on the job) or that there is no knowledge-base for teaching anyway. Yet much is known about how to teach effectively, and where it has not yet been fully incorporated into current teacher education programs, efforts must be made to strengthen rather than to eliminate these programs. Indeed, teacher education programs have been charged with preparing teachers for bureaucratic rather than professional practice, so they have fashioned courses of study in response to state certification and program approval guidelines that fit the task as it has been prescribed.

Shulman (1987, p. 8) classifies the elements of teaching knowledge as follows:

> content knowledge;
>
> general pedagogical knowledge, with special reference to those broad principles and strategies of classroom management and organization that appear to transcend subject matter;
>
> curriculum knowledge, with particular grasp of the materials and programs that serve as 'tools of the trade' for teachers;
>
> pedagogical content knowledge, that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding;
>
> knowledge of learners and their characteristics;
>
> knowledge of educational contexts, ranging from the workings of the group or classroom, the governance and financing of school districts, to the character of communities and cultures; and
>
> knowledge of educational ends, purposes and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds.

Note that only the first of these areas of knowledge could be generally expected of a typical liberal arts graduate. A rich and powerful conception of teaching knowledge is necessary if we are to develop professional standards of practice that can guide the technical decision-making that is rightfully and necessarily the role of teachers. The goal 'is not to indoctrinate or train teachers to behave in prescribed ways, but to educate teachers to reason soundly about their teaching as well as to perform skillfully . . . . Therefore, teacher education must work with the beliefs that guide teacher actions, with the principles and evidence that underlie the choices teachers make' (Shulman, 1987, p. 13).

This means teacher education that includes much more than courses in methods of teaching reading, methods of teaching social studies and so on. The current curriculum in many schools of education could be compared to training doctors in methods of treating cancer and techniques for treating heart disease, without any grounding in anatomy, physiology, biology or pathology. Technique without theory, evidence and knowledge of content does not provide a basis for professional decision-making. Thoughtful, reflective and effective teaching requires that teachers have rigorous grounding in cognitive sciences, so that they understand how people learn; in developmental psychology, so that they know when children are ready to learn particular things in particular ways; in learning theory and pedagogy; and in professional ethics, so that they can responsibly resolve dilemmas of teaching practice.

Teacher Induction

Consistent with this view of teaching knowledge and practice, serious and intensive induction of new teachers is necessary before they are allowed or expected to teach without supervision. This major departure from the current sink-or-swim approach to beginning teaching is crucial for two equally important reasons: (1) because teaching knowledge is complex and requires judgment in its application, it cannot be fully acquired in a classroom setting; and (2) because a teaching profession is first and foremost committed to the welfare of students, inexperienced practitioners cannot be allowed to learn on the job without guidance.

It is in the initial years of teaching that teachers learn how to apply theory in practice and what the norms of professional practice require. Without assistance they may fail to learn how to teach effectively, even as they acquire survival skills. Learning to cope and learning to teach are two entirely different programs of study. Balancing the many considerations about students, instructional goals and teaching strategies that go into effective teaching is a difficult job that can only be mastered under the tutelage of those expert in the art of teaching. Furthermore, supportive and sustained induction is necessary to stem high attrition rates of new teachers and to provide equity to students.

The current lack of support experienced by beginning teachers is exacerbated by typical school district placement policies. As McLaughlin (1986) has noted:

> New teachers are often given those students or courses with which experienced teachers do not wish to deal. Instead of giving beginning teachers a nurturing environment in which to grow, we throw them into a war zone where both the demands and the mortality rate are excessively high. It is really not surprising that almost one-third of teachers leave the profession within their first five years of teaching.

The placement of beginning teachers in the most difficult assignments is encouraged by district internal transfer policies which allow successful senior teachers to move to schools of their choice. Schools with high turnover rates — which also tend to be schools serving the most disadvantaged students in the most challenging teaching conditions — hire new teachers to fill their vacancies. When a vacancy arises in a desirable school, senior teachers tend to transfer away from the more difficult schools. Consequently, these schools are more likely to be staffed with disproportionate numbers of new and inexperienced teachers and are less likely to maintain an adequate cadre of expert, experienced teachers who can assist these novices. Thus beginning teachers are presented with the most difficult educational problems and with little opportunity for assistance. As a result, many experience frustration and leave the profession. Not incidentally, the students of these neophytes — those who most need expert teaching — are continually subjected to instruction by persons who are just learning — or perhaps not learning — how to teach (Wise *et al.*, 1987).

This damaging practice need not continue. A professional structure for teaching, recently created by contract in Rochester, New York, has eliminated teacher transfer rights based on seniority, while putting in place an intensive assistance and evaluation program for beginning teachers and veterans having difficulty, staffed by expert experienced teachers. Betting on the payoffs of recruiting and supporting talented teachers, the Rochester plan will boost salaries dramatically, establish peer evaluation for career advancement and establish professional development schools. As in other professions, teaching in Rochester will be based on serious, sustained induction and incentives for continued professional growth.

Serious induction does not mean four evaluations for a beginning teacher instead of two every year, or two evaluators filling out the evaluation checklist instead of one. What is needed is a type of induction in which expert, experienced practitioners have substantial time to provide continuous supervision to new practitioners, helping them learn to make the thousands of important decisions that a teacher must confront every day. This function can be best performed by mentor teachers providing expertise specific to the subject area or grade level taught, if they are given time to do so.

Ultimately, the creation of professional development schools in which expert teachers join with university faculty to provide a structured internship experience for new teachers would be the most effective means of inducting new teachers. Such schools would be exemplars of good practice, would produce and transmit knowledge of teaching to new entrants, and would provide the highest quality education to those students who now receive some of the lowest quality schooling.

Teacher Licensure and Hiring

The guarantee that those permitted to teach are in fact prepared to do so is fundamental to the development of professionalism. This is a key issue in teaching, where forty-six states maintain emergency licensure procedures and twenty-three have recently sanctioned a double standard for entry by adopting alternative certification provisions that minimize the training needed to teach (Darling-Hammond and Barnett, in press). These loopholes are deemed necessary by state officials to ensure an adequate supply of teachers, but by failing

to distinguish the roles and responsibilities less prepared entrants are qualified to assume, they fundamentally undermine the presumption that all professionals will share common knowledge and commitments. They permit autonomous practice by those who have not satisfied the prerequisites for public trust.

Current teacher shortages make this concern particularly pressing. Whenever shortages result in the lowering of standards for entry, public confidence in the capacity of teachers to make sound educational decisions declines, and the press for regulation of teaching increases. This is a situation where the alternatives available within the current structure of teaching seem constrained to distasteful trade-offs. If untrained teachers are admitted to full membership in the occupation, the risk of uninformed practice — and student mistreatment — is high. If one does not lower standards, and a shortage of teachers results, the alternatives are also suboptimal: enlarged class sizes, constricted program offerings, misassignment of current teachers. This bind occurs because current school and teaching structures do not yet envision diversity of teaching structures and roles, and do not really permit professional supervision.

In other professions differentiated roles and responsibilities have gradually emerged as a means for balancing the requirements of supply and qualifications. Those not fully certified or less extensively trained are limited to performing tasks for which they have been prepared, and they practise under supervision. Complex decisions are reserved to those qualified to make such judgments. The Holmes Group's recommendation that untrained college graduates be hired only as instructors who practise under the supervision of certified teachers is a step in this direction (Holmes Group, 1986).

Differentiating teaching roles in schools so that real supervision is possible will require a different formulation of teacher responsibilities and classroom groupings than is currently found in most schools. Rather than each teacher being solely responsible for a group of thirty students, we will need to encourage the kinds of team teaching arrangements found in some schools where a group of practitioners takes responsibility for a larger group of students. In a setting where, say, three professional teachers and two instructors are responsible for 100 students, many possibilities become apparent for appropriate supervision, for organizing large- and small-group instruction, for consulting about teaching plans and decisions, and for developing strategies for meeting individual children's needs. These possibilities are explored further below.

Structuring Responsible Practice

The goal that professionals will continually seek to discover what is the most responsible course of action suggests that ongoing professional development and norms of inquiry are extremely important. But because knowledge is constantly expanding, problems of practice are complex, and ethical dilemmas result from conflict between legitimate goals, this requirement cannot be satisfied by prescriptions for practice or unchanging rules of conduct. Instead, the transmission and enforcement of these norms must be accomplished by socialization to a professional standard which incorporates continual learning, reflection and concern with the multiple effects of one's actions on others as fundamental aspects of the professional role.

While appropriate practice cannot be reduced to rules and lodged in concrete, there must be means for encouraging its pursuit even where the correct course of action is not a routine judgment. Though standardized practice is inadequate, we cannot accept the notion that *any* practice is appropriate. What is sought cannot be achieved through either more precise legislation on practice nor by total discretion for individual teachers. Instead, we are seeking to vest in members of the profession a common set of understandings about what is known *and* a common commitment to test and move beyond that knowledge for the good of individual students and the collective advancement of professional understanding.

Several conditions are necessary for the support of teacher learning. First, meaningful processes for teacher evaluation must be created to sustain professional development. Second, teacher isolation must be overcome so that opportunities to discuss problems of practice can be frequent and regular. Finally, teacher involvement in evaluation of practice and in decision-making about policies and practices must be established.

Creating Meaningful Evaluation

The evaluation of teachers by principals and other supervisors has been a longstanding practice in American schools. Teachers anticipate that annual brief visit from the principal who, according to the stereotype, stands stone-faced at the back of the classroom filling out a form; and principals rush to squeeze in their visits to teachers amidst their myriad other duties.

In most school districts teacher evaluation is a perfunctory, routine, bureaucratic requirement that yields no help to teachers and no decision-oriented information to the school district. The process does nothing for teachers except contribute to their weariness and reinforce their skepticism about bureaucratic routine. Isolated from decision-making and planning, it does little for administrators except add to their workload. It does not provide a mechanism for the school system to communicate its expectations concerning teaching, except that teaching is a fit subject for bureaucratization.

Very rarely does this ritual have other outcomes such as the special recognition of a teacher or the termination of his or her employment, the improvement of curriculum or program activities, or the deployment of staff development resources to meet teachers' specific instructional needs. The ritual exists to satisfy the bureaucratic imperative that every teacher be inspected by an administrator every year. Indeed, it is fashioned to preclude any other outcome. The time of the evaluator is too short, the span of control too wide and the expertise too limited to produce reliable and valid insights that might lead to significant action. Actions predicated on the ritual prove difficult to institute because the database is too sparse and unstable to withstand the scrutiny that accompanies any important change in teacher status or teaching practice.

Bureaucratic evaluation relies on administrators (chiefly principals) to assess teachers in a standard manner using general criteria, such as generic teaching skills (does the teacher plan? set objectives? teach to the objectives? cover the curriculum?) or other context-free teaching behaviors. Bureaucratic evaluation is highly standardized, procedurally oriented and organized by checklist. These attributes, intended to ensure reliability, limit the relevance and utility of evaluation for most teachers and many purposes. This form of

evaluation can, at best, support assessments of minimal competence. It cannot attend to the appropriateness or outcomes of instruction, provide assistance to competent teachers on their specific goals or refinements of particular pedagogical techniques, or address the substance and long-range consequences of instruction.

Professional evaluation, on the other hand, involves teachers in the development and operation of teacher evaluation processes, bases evaluation on professional standards of practice that are client-oriented, recognizes multiple teaching strategies and learning outcomes, and treats teachers differently according to their teaching assignments, stages of development and classroom goals. If tenured teachers can be assumed to be competent, based on careful selection and induction, then the presumed need for annual inspections of teacher performance to 'catch' incompetence can be greatly reduced. Evaluative activity can then be explictly aimed at continuing professional development, and can be geared to individual needs and goals.

The most appropriate strategies for growth-oriented evaluation are personal goal setting and self-evaluation, joined with peer-mediated and situationally relevant reviews of practice, conducted by teachers sharing similar expertise and teaching assignments. Successful models of such practices have been established and documented (Wise *et al.*, 1984a, 1984b; Barber, 1984). They share in common an emphasis on reflective, goal-oriented improvement in teaching and access to relevant learning opportunities and expert advice.

The formative and individually relevant character of such a teacher evaluation process must be safeguarded by the existence of alternative avenues for addressing the infrequent but important problems of veteran teachers who experience extreme difficulty in maintaining professional standards of practice. Most teacher evaluation systems are notably ineffective at gaining help for these teachers or removing them from classrooms. Typically, both unions and administrators play ostrich while these teachers are transferred from one school to another, because neither the will nor the resources are present to assist them or terminate their employment.

Districts that have successfully tackled this problem have created separate processes for the referral, assistance and assessment of teachers having difficulty. These processes are established in collaboration with teacher associations and provide intensive assistance by an expert veteran teacher in the appropriate subject area under the supervision of a committee of teachers and administrators. The committee takes responsibility for safeguarding the teacher's due process rights, ensuring that a plan of improvement is formulated and sufficient assistance is given, and recommending return to non-probationary teaching status if the needed improvement is secured or termination of employment if it is not. By extending the resources available for assistance and documentation, and expanding the supervision of the process, it becomes sufficiently fair, objective, and careful to produce defensible decisions (Wise *et al.*, 1984a; Darling-Hammond, 1986). This, indeed, produces professional accountability.

All of the evaluation processes described above — for induction, for professional development, for personnel decision-making — are based on an assumption foreign to the bureaucratic world view: that teachers have much to share and learn from each other. In traditional evaluation practices, talk about teaching is limited to a one-on-one interaction between an administrator and a teacher in one or two post-observation conferences each

year. This is obviously an extremely inefficient way to promote consensus about professional teaching practices. Knowledge about teaching must be shared if it is to be extended from one classroom to another.

Overcoming Teacher Isolation

The vision of teaching work as it is implemented in American schools is one where the teacher's job is to instruct large groups of students for most of the working day. The other tasks of teaching — preparation, planning, curriculum development, tutoring those in need of additional help, consulting with other professionals, seeking answers to student or classroom problems, working with parents — are deemed so unimportant that little or no time is made available for these activities. With the exception of most teachers' daily 'prep period', usually spent filling out forms and trying to get access to the xerox machine, teachers have virtually no planned time to consult with their colleagues.

One twenty-year high school teacher vividly described the extent of teacher isolation when he remarked: 'I have taught 20,000 classes; I have been evaluated 30 times; but I have never seen another teacher teach.' This kind of teacher isolation stands in the way of developing professional standards of practice, because there is no basis on which to develop consensus or to explore alternatives. This situation is largely due to the egg-crate classroom structure and the factory-based notion that students are processed through these classrooms in standard-sized groups. Alternative procedures for grouping, teaching and learning are not envisioned; flexibility cannot be easily accommodated.

Other countries, including Japan, China and West Germany, structure teaching much differently (see e.g. Shimahara, 1985). A typical high school teacher might teach standard-sized groups of students approximately fifteen hours out of a forty to forty-five hour school week. The remainder of that time is used for preparation and joint curriculum planning, tutoring of individuals or small groups, and consultations with parents, students and colleagues. The time spent in large-group instruction is more profitably used, because it can be more appropriately structured to fit the needs of students and goals of instruction; instruction is better prepared; and particular problems or special student needs can be individually addressed in the remaining time available. Students need not fall inexorably behind in this system. Teachers need not suffer the frustrations that come from the schedule constraints that preclude dealing with important teaching matters as they arise.

Under conditions such as these teachers can work collegially to design programs, to shape appropriate learning experiences for students and to develop shared standards of professional practice. They can evaluate their work and make the decisions that are needed to continually improve schooling. There are many ways such restructuring can be accomplished if we are willing to abandon preconceptions of how schools ought to look and work. These range from team teaching arrangements with joint planning time for teachers to core curriculum arrangements which reduce the absolute number of students each teacher must come to know while maintaining overall teacher-pupil ratios. Varying class formats and uses of teacher and student time are possible when teaching responsibilities are shared and emphasis is placed on personalizing teacher-student relationships rather than processing students through fragmented courses and grade levels. Ted Sizer's Coalition of Essential Schools has created a number of productive teaching arrangements within existing per pupil resource limits. Many others are possible.

Equal emphasis must be placed on regularized opportunities for teachers to share what they know, to consult about problems of practice and to observe one another teaching. This means adjusting schedules to provide shared time and adjusting expectations about the use of time in faculty meetings, in-service sessions and other shared settings. These changes will come about when attention to learning in schools takes precedence over attention to rules, regimens and procedures. The metaphor changes from one of schools as factories to schools as knowledge work organizations, in which students are workers, teachers are managers, and principals are managers of managers. As managers, teachers will be expected to allocate the use of time and resources as needed to being about the goals of the organization, not just within set blocks of classroom time but in a larger framework that allows for additional interactions with students — individually and in small groups — with parents and with colleagues.

Involvement in Professional Decision-making

Much of the discussion above has centered on teacher responsibility for professional practice. However, where there is no responsibility for shaping practice,there can be no accountability for appropriate practice, only for following standard operating procedures. It does little good to diagnose problems, if there are no means available then to correct them.

Teacher involvement in school decision-making is currently a relatively haphazard occurrence. Although in some school districts teachers participate on committees responsible for textbook selection, curriculum development and staff development, in others these decisions are made primarily by administrators or school board members. In only a very few schools or districts do teachers have an effective voice in decisions that structure teaching work: decisions about class scheduling, course requirements, student placements, program development or teacher assignments. In even fewer do teachers have any input into personnel decisions concerning the hiring, evaluation and tenure of either teachers or administrators.

Lack of voice in these matters means that teachers are often expected to practise their profession under conditions that may be administratively convenient but not especially conducive to effective teaching. It is important that peer review be considered in this broader context of teacher collaboration in decision-making and problem-solving. The substitution or supplementation of principals by teachers in traditional evaluation processes in and of itself will do little to change the overall role of teachers in professional decision-making. It is the degree to which teachers assume collective responsibility for instructional quality that determines professionalism. Such involvement must be pervasive if it is to produce a professional conception of teaching.

Aside from personnel evaluation, there is another evaluative function rarely performed in schools which is central to the operation of other professional organizations. That function is ongoing review of practice by staff who also play a major role in establishing the policies which, in large measure, determine that practice. This evaluative function serves the joint purposes of monitoring organizational activities and establishing a continuous dialogue about problems of practice among the practitioners themselves. The very distant analog in school systems is program evaluation, an activity generally conducted by central office researchers who report findings to government sponsors and

school board members. Teachers are neither the major producers nor consumers of such information. Hence neither they nor their students are the major beneficiaries of such evaluation results.

Teachers need to discuss and take responsibility for resolving immediate, concrete problems of teaching practice if teaching lore is ever to be transformed into meaningful professional standards. One could envision many methods for achieving this. Standing committees such as those used in hospitals could meet monthly to review practices in various subject areas or grade levels, or to examine other functional areas: academic progress; student discipline; grading policies; student and teacher assignments to particular courses, programs or teams; organization and scheduling of classes; and so on. Or more flexible approaches might be tried. Roland Barth (1988) describes how faculty meetings can be used to examine and change curricular strategies across grade levels and classrooms. School problem-solving strategies often start with those matters of most immediate concern to the school community as a whole. What is critical is that teachers have both time to pursue these evaluations as part of their role (rather than as 'released' or extracurricular time) and authority to make changes based on their collective discoveries.

The effective schools literature has confirmed the value of faculty decision-making. This research indicates that participatory school management by teachers and principals, based on collaborative planning, collegial problem-solving and constant intellectual sharing, produces both student learning gains and increased teacher satisfaction and retention (Mackenzie, 1983; Pratzner, 1984). These schools also feature principals who are effective leaders, and studies show that such principals create conditions in which teacher leadership, peer support and assistance, and participation in decision-making are encouraged.

Teachers in collaborative settings practise a form of peer review and evaluation when they identify problems, observe one another, share ideas and ask, 'How are we doing?' The inquiry ethic that permeates effective schools improves standards of practice by decreasing teacher isolation and providing directly relevant opportunities for professional growth.

Decision-making and Accountability

The requirements for professionalism outlined above suggest new modes of decision-making and different guidelines for allocating educational resources and responsibilities. Teachers and principals are prominently involved in decisions currently made at the top of the system and handed down for implementation. Resources that would otherwise be devoted to developing and administering mandates, rules and reporting systems are shifted instead to the support of those functions that ensure and support competence in classrooms — teacher selection, induction and evaluation processes; professional development activities and time for teachers to engage and solve teaching problems. Less money and energy are devoted to creating bureaus, offices and programs to solve problems and more to supporting school settings that can prevent problems.

Many objections to professionalization of teaching have been raised on grounds of costs, practicability and accountability. These objections start from the view that the present system will be retained intact and 'professionalization' will be added on, creating

expense, unclear lines of authority and confusion. The add-on approach to school reform has certainly added to the financial and logistical burdens of operating schools. Instead, the movement toward a professional basis for teaching will require rethinking the ways in which resources are allocated, responsibilities are divided and accountability is sought.

Allocation of Resources

Teacher professionalism proposals almost always incorporate recommendations for substantial increases in teacher salaries, often linked to changes in career advancement structures for teachers. This is because attracting and retaining well trained knowledgeable individuals into an occupation generally requires compensation competitive with that they could receive if they entered other fields requiring similar levels of knowledge and training. Proposals to provide intensive induction of teachers and time for professional discourse and problem-solving have cost implications as well. Some critics believe that the public will never be willing or able to afford a system that compensates and supports teachers in a manner comparable to other professions.

This is probably true if current school structures and modes of investment were to continue. It is instructive to note that as bureaucratization has taken hold in American schools, teacher salaries slipped from 49 per cent of educational expenditures in 1972 to only 38 per cent in 1982 (Darling-Hammond, 1984). When just over a third of school expenditures pay the salaries of teachers, we have obviously moved a long way from the image of education as Mark Hopkins at one end of the log and the student at the other. Clearly, other uses of school dollars have grown proportionately, making these resources less available for supporting teachers.

Data from the Center for Education Statistics indicate that the number of administrative staff in school systems grew by 183 per cent between 1955 and 1985, while the number of teachers increased at half that rate (CES, 1982, 1987). Most of the administrative increase in recent years has been at levels above the school — central and area offices — as the number of school-level principals and supervisors has risen only slightly since 1970. In 1986 more than 21 per cent of elementary and secondary school employees were engaged in administrative functions; 58 per cent were engaged in teaching and other professional specialities. (The remainder were engaged in service, maintenance and transportation activities.) (US Department of Labor, 1986). Thus, excluding service workers, school systems in 1986 employed approximately one administrative staff person for every two and a half teachers. This suggests a very top-heavy approach to the management of schooling.

Professionalizing teaching suggests a redefinition of administrative structures and roles, and hence reallocation of educational dollars. If teachers assume many of the instructional tasks currently performed by administrative staff (e.g. curriculum development and supervision), the layers of bureaucratic hierarchy will be reduced. If teachers are more carefully selected and better trained and supported, expenditures for management systems to control incompetence will be unnecessary. If, for example, investments are made in the front-end of the teaching career for induction support and pre-tenure evaluation, the costs of continually recruiting and hiring new entrants to replace the 40 to 50 per cent who leave in the first few years will decline; the costs of band-aid approaches to staff development for those who have not learned to teach effectively will be reduced; and the

costs of remediating or seeking to dismiss poor teachers — as well as compensating for the effects of their poor teaching on children — will decrease. Strategic investment in teacher competence frees resources for innovation and learning.

Furthermore, more effective and efficient solutions to perennial school problems can be found by tackling them at the source than by creating bureaucratic offices to administer add-on programs that treat problem symptoms in compartmentalized fashion. An examination of the bureaucratic superstructure of any large school system will illuminate the point. Having created large, impersonal and bureaucratic structures for processing students through schools, students experience problems in adapting themselves to the procedures.

In the typical urban high school, for example, because teachers do not have time to address the multitudinous needs of the 150 or so students they see each day, and because personal attention is difficult to sustain in a school of 2000 or 3000 students, and because students' needs, interests and aspirations do not fit comfortably in the course schedules, tracks, curricula and other standardized regimens of the institution, many problems occur. These range from violence, vandalism and other disciplinary problems to alienation expressed in truancy, early pregnancy and dropping out to underachievement, anomie and disinterest in school.

Rather than personalizing and humanizing the educational experience to prevent some of these problems, the bureaucratic solution is to create new offices, job titles and programs that seek to compensate for the predictable effects of an ill-designed system. Thus we have created roles for counselors (each of whom is responsible for hundreds of students' personal problems!), social workers and instructional specialists; we have created separate offices and staffs to deal with school security, teen pregnancy prevention, dropout prevention, drug abuse prevention, compensatory education, truancy and so on. Each of these offices has its own bureaucratic hierarchy, paperwork and reporting requirements; its own constituency and 'target population'; its own add-ons to the school curriculum or program structure, as though carving up students into little pieces that correspond to programs will somehow solve the fundamental problems of their maladaptation to a bureaucratized, dehumanized system of schooling.

Needless to say, when the problems are not solved, the offices are expanded to meet the increased 'need' for their services. Thus bureaucracy feeds on the fruits of its own labor, and resources for schools and classrooms are deflected to new and expanded bureaus and special programs administered from the central office. The root causes of school problems will not be addressed until resources are made available at the school level to implement sensible solutions that create conditions under which teachers and students can interact more productively. A more efficient use of school dollars to change the school conditions that result in problems will largely finance the costs of securing professional teaching conditions.

This means that decisions about the uses of many school resources must be made by faculty, principals and parents to ensure that these uses address community needs and local problems. Restructuring decision-making processes is an even more politically charged issue than reallocating resources, though the two are closely linked. At the crux of the matter are allocations of authority and responsibility to roles and levels in the educational system.

Allocating Responsibility and Authority

In large school bureaucracies, authority for decision and responsibility for practice are widely separated, usually by many layers of hierarchy. Boards and top-level administrators make decisions while teachers, principals and students are responsible for carrying them out. It is for this reason that accountability for results is hard to achieve. When the desired outcomes of hierarchically imposed policies are not realized, policy-makers blame the school people responsible for implementation; practitioners blame their inability to devise or pursue better solutions on the constraints of policy. No one can be fully accountable for the results of practice when authority and responsibility are dispersed.

Furthermore, when authority for decision-making is far removed from practitioners and is regulatory in nature, change comes slowly. Dysfunctional consequences for students cannot be quickly remedied while edicts hang on, immune from the realities of school life and protected by the forces of inertia, lobbies and constituencies both inside and outside the bureaucracy. The amount of effort and influence required to change a school system policy is so great that most teachers, principals and parents find it impossible to deflect their energies from their primary jobs to the arduous and often unrewarding task of moving the behemoth. They sigh and strive to cope, looking for loopholes that might allow unobtrusive alternatives to grow for a time.

The symptoms of advancing bureaucracy include (1) lack of flexibility at the school level for allocating resources — dollars, people and time — to meet the unique educational needs of students (2) lack of flexibility in the classroom for determining teaching methods, materials and processes when texts, curricula, schedules and testable outcomes are already prescribed; (3) standardization of inputs — numbers of secretaries, specialists, counselors, texts, supply budgets and so on are predetermined; and (4) increases in paperwork required to communicate directives and to monitor student and school activities, because external decision-making is enforced by reporting systems.

Thus adjustments in programs, course requirements, schedules, staffing and materials to meet the needs of students are difficult to make; the knowledge of school staff about more productive alternatives is not used; and time is deflected from teaching to paperwork, monitoring and reporting systems. Even where flexibility might exist, the pressures for conformity are so strong that principals and teachers are often afraid to test the limits of the regulatory structure. The end result is that when problems are identified, practitioners often claim they have no authority to change the status quo. Eventually a general acceptance of the failings of the system comes to prevail, and cynicism overwhelms problem-solving initiatives by principals, teachers or parents.

When authority is removed from the school, so is accountability for learning. Until authority for making decisions is granted to those who have responsibility for performing the work — those who are living with these decisions on a daily basis — reform of practice cannot occur and accountability cannot be secured.

School-level decision-making makes some people nervous for at least two reasons. First, there are legitimate concerns that educationally harmful decisions will be made, or that equal treatment of students will not occur. Second, there are concerns that collaborative decision-making at the school level is simply not practicable — that ultimately, no one will be in charge, and chaos will reign. These concerns deserve careful attention.

With respect to the first concern, it is helpful to divide responsibilities between those that must be centrally administered and those that, by their nature, cannot be effectively administered in a hierarchical fashion. Wise (1979) offers a useful distinction between *equity* and *productivity* concerns. The former generally must be resolved by higher units of governance, since

> Inequalities in the allocation of resources, opportunities, and programs are generally problems which arise out of the conflicting interests of majorities and minorities and of the powerful and the powerless. Because local institutions are apparently the captives of majoritarian politics, they intentionally and unintentionally discriminate. Consequently, we must rely upon the policymaking system to solve problems of inequity in the operating educational system. (p. 206)

As Wise notes, though, 'productivity questions are intrinsically more difficult than equity questions because they arise not out of a political impasse but from a fundamental lack of knowledge about how to teach' (p. 53). The shortcomings of scientific knowledge are not due to a general absence of knowledge about teaching but to the fact that the appropriate use of teaching knowledge is highly individualized, while policies are necessarily uniform and standardized. Thus policy decisions about methods of teaching and schooling processes cannot ever meet the demands of varying school and student circumstances.

> Problems of low productivity cannot . . . be solved by policy intervention. No science or technology of education can form a firm basis for policy intended to improve productivity . . . . Consequently, efforts to improve educational productivity can and should continue at the institutional level. (Wise, 1979, pp. 206–7)

There must be some responsibility for decision-making at the level of the Board of Education, which is accountable to the public for setting educational goals and seeing that they are pursued in an equitable fashion. These responsibilities include allocating resources equitably among schools, setting standards of equity for students and employees, setting standards for competence among the professional staff and defining in broad terms the goals which the school system should pursue. The Board and the central staff, however, should not seek to legislate or regulate the details of how education is delivered to students.

If these decisions about the delivery of education are to be made at the school-level, questions about how collaborative and responsible decision-making can be structured must be answered. There are many models that have been used successfully in individual schools. For purposes of illustration, though, the following discussion focuses on an approach to 'shared governance' implemented in an entire school district over many years. This approach, developed in Salt Lake City (and earlier used by the same superintendent in Newark, (California), demonstrates how voice, responsibility, authority and accountability can be secured in the best interests of students. (The description of this approach is based on a longer discussion in Wise *et al.*, 1984a.)

Salt Lake City's shared governance approach is based on four principles: delegation, consensus and parity, review and appeal, and trust, openness and equity. The principle of delegation was established by the board of education, which agreed to delegate all but the

most important decisions to the superintendent with the proviso that he administer the schools 'in cooperation with the employees and the patrons of the school district'. Delegation continues with the superintendent's delegation of specific responsibilities to teachers and parents and inclusion of this agreement in the teachers' association contract. Teachers and administrators cooperatively develop budget proposals; all administrative meetings are open to teacher representatives; and teachers, principals and parents variously serve on specific committees and councils, including school-community councils, school improvements councils and teacher evaluation committees.

The principle of consensus and parity encourages school and central office governing councils to reach consensus by specifying parity voting when consensus is not reached. Each parity casts one vote: in a school community council the faculty gets one vote and the patrons as a whole get one vote; in a school improvement council the principal gets one vote and the faculty gets one vote. When a committee resorts to parity voting because it cannot achieve consensus, it explicitly acknowledges impasse and it forfeits the decision to the superintendent or, ultimately, the board. Thus substantial incentives exist for working toward consensus, and shared goals invested with authority and choice energize the efforts of practitioners and parents.

Consensus and parity attempt to avoid what the superintendent called 'power negotiations', in which councils, committees and groups 'utilize numbers to win a position: stack the committee, circulate petitions, etc.' It provides an alternative to the traditional, autocratic styles of educational leadership in which 'principals and superintendents base many of their decisions and actions on the sovereignty of their positions; they enforce their power in handing down decisions which may or may not be beneficial to students.'

The third principle — review and appeal — allows for traditional grievance processes, resolution of impasses in the shared governance councils, and a hearing for any complaint by any citizen, school employee or student by a neutral third party on any matter thought to be unfair, unjust or not in the best interests of students. This buttresses the fourth principle — trust, openness and equity — a collection of processes designed to combat the 'mistrust and suspicion which were creeping into the educational system, on the part of teachers and administrators as well as from the community and students.' These processes include open disclosure requirements — that teachers share their expectations for classrooms with parents — and processes to ensure curriculum equity and other goals. Best characterized as faith in the consent of the governed, these approaches to consensual decision-making allow the blind spots or self-interests of any given group to be checked by others.

Decision-making responsibilities are carefully defined. Principals and faculty on the school improvement councils make program decisions, within the constraints of broad board policy, decisions about teachers' assignments and teaching loads, and curricular decisions. Parents and faculty on school community councils make decisions about length and timing of the school day, school safety and rules, and curricular emphases in the school. Veto power is built in to preclude decisions outside the parameters of board policy, but most decision are 'owned' by the faculty and patrons of the school.

There are many other models of shared governance available and in use. The point is that, with careful thought and confidence in the power of people to make reasoned and

enlightened decisions, educationally sound, democratic governance is not only possible; it is preferable to prescriptions that reach beyond their means to effect change.

Accountability

Ultimately, the question is how accountability for student learning can be enhanced. The first-order question is what accountability consists of. Many currently equate accountability with something like monitoring of student test scores or tabulations of school management indicators. Unfortunately, this view leaves the student, the parent, the teacher and the educational process entirely out of the equation. What parents have a right to expect when they are compelled to send their children to a public school is that their child will be under the care of competent people, who are committed to using the best knowledge available to meet the individual needs of that child. The parent has no assurance of accountability by virtue of knowing that school district procedures have been promulgated and school staff are required to file reports about these procedures.

Bureaucratic accountability can provide only the latter kind of assurance. It does not focus on the competence of staff but on the power of mandates to tell them what to do. It does not focus on the transmittal and use of teaching knowledge but on the regulation of standardized teaching practices, which by definition must, in some instances, fail to meet the needs of unstandardized students.

Professional accountability starts from a different premise. Its first assumption is that, since the work is too complex to be hierarchically prescribed and controlled, it must be structured so that practitioners can make responsible decisions, both individually and collectively. Accountability is provided by rigorous training and careful selection, serious and sustained internships for beginners, meaningful teacher evaluation, opportunities for professional development and ongoing peer review of practice — buttressed by collegial decision-making and consultation. By such means professionals learn from each other, norms are established and transmitted, problems are exposed and tackled, parents' concerns are heard and students' needs are better met.

In such a system parents can expect that no teacher will be hired who has not had adequate training in how to teach; no teacher will be permitted to practise without supervision until he/she has mastered the professional knowledge base and its application; no teacher will be granted tenure who has not fully demonstrated his/her competence; and no decision about students will be made without adequate knowledge of good practice in the light of students needs. Establishing professional norms of operation, by the many vehicles outlined above, creates as well a basis for parent input and standards and methods for redress of unsuitable practice that do not exist in a bureaucratic system of school administration. Enforcing professional standards is the only way to stop the educational buck-passing that is encouraged, indeed produced, by hierarchical decision-making.

If openness, trust and equity are to be realized in the public educational system, then radical steps must be taken properly to align responsibility and authority, to achieve the consent of the governed, and to promote knowledge-based decisions that focus on the needs of students. This work is not easy, and will not be accomplished quickly. As Clark and Meloy (1987) have noted:

360

> We counsel patience in the development of and experimentation with new organizational forms. We have been patient and forgiving of our extant form. Remember that new forms will also be ideal forms. Do not press them immediately to their point of absurdity. Bureaucracy as an ideal form became tempered by adjectival distinctions — bounded, contingent, situational. New forms need to be granted the same exceptions as they are proposed and tested. No one seriously imagines a utopian alternative to bureaucracy. But realistic alternatives can be formed that consistently trade off control for freedom, the organization for the individual. And they can be built upon the principle of the consent of the governed (p. 40).

New forms of organization, which support the conditions for professionalism in the public interest and which ensure accountability in fact rather than in form only, must be developed if schools are to work effectively for all students and if responsible and responsive educational decisions are to be made.

References

BARBER, L.W. (1984) *Teacher Evaluation and Merit Pay: Background Papers for the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth* (Working Paper No. TF-83-5). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

BARTH, R. (May 1988) 'Principals, Teachers and School Leadership', *Kappan* 69(9) pp. 639–42.

CARNEGIE FORUM ON EDUCATION AND THE ECONOMY (1986) *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS (1982) *Digest of Education Statistics*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education.

CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS (1987) *Digest of Education Statistics*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education.

CLARK, D.L. and MELOY, J.M. (October 1987) 'Recanting Bureaucracy: A Democratic Structure for Leadership in Schools.' Unpublished manuscript. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia.

CREMIN, L.A. (1965) *The Genius of American Education*. New York: Vintage Books.

DARLING-HAMMOND, L. (1984) *Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

DARLING-HAMMOND, L. (March 1986) 'A Proposal for Evaluation in the Teaching Profession', *Elementary School Journal*, 86(4): pp. 1–21.

DARLING-HAMMOND, L. and BARNETT, B. (in press) *The Evolution of Teacher Policy*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

DARLING-HAMMOND, L. and WISE, A.E. (January 1985) 'Beyond Standardization: State Standards and School Improvement', *The Elementary School Journal*, 85(3): pp. 315–36.

DEWEY, J. (1900) *The School and Society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press (reprinted).

GERTH, H.H. and MILLS, C.W. (1958) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

HOLMES GROUP (1986) Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

MACKENZIE, D.E. (1983) 'Research for School Improvement: An Appraisal of Some Recent Trends,' *Educational Researcher*, 12: pp. 5–17.

MCLAUGHLIN, M.W. (1986) 'Why Teachers Won't Teach', *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67: pp. 420–6.

PRATZNER, F.C. (1984) 'Quality of School Life: Foundations for Improvement,' *Educational Researcher*, 13(3): pp. 20–5.

SHIMAHARA, N.K. 'Japanese Education and its Implications for U.S. Education', *Phi Delta Kappan*, Feb 1985, pp. 418–21.

SHULMAN, L. (February 1987) 'Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform,' *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1): pp. 1–22.

SIZER, T.R. (1984) *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

US DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (1986) Current Population Survey, 1986–87. Unpublished data.

WISE, A.E. (1979) *Legislated Learning*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

WISE, A.E., DARLING-HAMMOND, L., MCLAUGHLIN, M.W. and BERNSTEIN, H.T. (1984a) *Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

WISE, A.E., DARLING-HAMMOND, L., MCLAUGHLIN, M.W. and BERNSTEIN, H.T. (1984b) *Case Studies for Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

WISE, A.E., DARLING-HAMMOND, L., BERRY, B., *et al.* (1987) *Effective Teacher Selection: From Recruitment to Retention*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Chapter 3

What Are Schools of Education For?*

Seymour B. Sarason

My purpose here is not to locate and discuss attitudes and forces external to the field of education that have had adverse effects on its development and accomplishments but rather to discuss features that are internal to a school of education. My discussion is based on the assumption that in viewing and moving to the future our schools of education cannot be satisfied with where they have been, that their mission must undergo substantive and directional change. Schools of education are in dangerous times precisely because education has returned to the national agenda and there is reason to believe that, consistent with our traditions and past practices, money and a renewed national resolve to improve education will be the major ingredients of the 'new answer' to our educational ills. The current national discussion has one characteristic that is as startling as it is discouraging. I refer to the apparently total amnesia for the fact that everything being said and recommended today was said and recommended in the years following Sputnik in 1957. Why the post-Sputnik efforts fell so short of the mark, despite billions of federal dollars, is a question that is going unraised and undiscussed. The superficiality of the present discussion — a discussion more fitting for a morality play than for planning educational change — should be a cause for anxiety in educators with intact memories. If the script for this morality play is acted out the way I fear it will, it will be another instance of 'the more things change, the more they remain the same'. That is an optimistic view because I believe that the stakes are higher and that the losses will be greater than ever before. We know that our world has changed, but we do not feel in control of these changes — at our cores we are far from sure that we know what to do. Intuitively we know that there is something radically wrong in the relationship between schools and society and that radically different responses from those in the past will be necessary if we are not to be victims of a self-defeating repetition of past events. There is a crisis of confidence and a bankruptcy of ideas. In our past there have always been crisies, severe and incapacitating ones, but there was always the bedrock feeling that we would surmount them in a manner consistent with our values and traditions. Today far fewer people, young and old, have that feeling.

We know that the world of our fathers is not our world, and that our world is not

* This chapter was prepared originally as the Fiftieth Anniversary Education Convocation Address, Syracuse University, 23 September 1983.

53

that of our children. What we do not know, what plagues us, is how to explain these past changes — to explain them in ways that give direction and purpose to our futures. That brings me to the first aspect of the challenge facing us as educators. That aspect, put in terms of the past, was the failure of schools of education to inquire into the ways that our society was changing. More specifically, in the process of allocating more personnel and resources to study schools and all that goes on in them, our schools of education neglected, relatively speaking, to investigate sources of societal change that would have significant impact on our schools. The sad truth is that educators in the post-Second World War era were not better prepared than anyone else, perhaps worse prepared, for what began to happen in the late 1950s and the sizzling 1960s. During those years the vast gulf between school and society was exposed. The isolation of schools from their social surround, especially in our urban centers, was pierced, giving rise to conflicts and violence during which a lot of lives and careers were adversely affected. Why were we so unprepared? To what had we been so insensitive? In our focus on what was happening in schools what were we not attending to outside them? These are questions I have addressed in several places. Here I wish to elaborate on a point which I consider to be not only a major part of the answer to these questions but a particularly clear instance of a conceptual and cultural narrowness against which we must guard if we are to be adequate to the challenge before us.

I venture the opinion that when the history of our society in this century is written, from vantage points far more dispassionate and less culture-bound than ours of today, a significant chapter will be about the GI Bill of Rights. That landmark legislation has to be seen, of course, in terms of the Second World War. During that war, which was a world war in a way that the First World War was not, our entire society experienced its effects. The Second World War was truly global, and never before had so many people and institutions in our society been so meaningfully involved in or affected by a war. Millions of individuals literally stopped 'working' and entered the armed services. The fabric of millions of families was altered as one or more of its members left for war. The frequency of new marriages among young people increased, as did the number of forced separations. Many fathers never saw their offspring until the war ended. Many never saw them because they died in battle. Many of these new marriages encountered all kinds of strains, not only because of the factor of forced separation, but also because of the fantasies and realities of infidelity. Women entered the workforce in large numbers, a fact which had significance beyond the economic, because it provided them with a frequently, unexpectedly, satisfying sense of self in a social context. The war, as always, presented a bitter pill for parents having to withstand the real possibility that they would never see their children again, or that they would see them maimed. For the most part, wars are fought by young people, but the price paid by their parents (who are more numerous) is in its own way terrifying. For the United States the war lasted four years, although the draft was started in 1940. Five or six years in the life of a society are not long except when they are accompanied by major changes in the accustomed way in which people experience their lives, their relationships to each other and their traditional institutions. To live for and dream of a return to normalcy at the same time that one is adapting to a quite different state of affairs — and to live this way for several years, which in the life of an individual is a very, very long time — is an invitation to disillusionment.

There are many ways to characterize the war years. One is to say they were years of

anxious waiting — waiting in terms of individual goals as well as for societal stability and world peace. The anxiety stemmed not only from ambiguity about whether the war would be won, but also from uncertainty about how and when it would end, and at what price. Bear in mind that for the first half of the war Germany, Italy and Japan seemed on the road to victory. Even near the war's end in Europe, when Germany seemed on the way to defeat, it mounted a counteroffensive which came close to turning the tide. If people greeted the atomic bombings of Nagasaki and Hiroshima with satisfaction and relief, those feelings can be understood in the context of an end to anxious waiting. From the vantage point of the post-war years, questions can be raised about the use of the atomic bomb. Some of these questions are legitimate, particularly those based on the assumption that means should have been taken to demonstrate to Japan the holocaustic consequences of the new weapon. But I have little doubt that if there had been a public referendum on the use of the bomb, the vote would have been ovewhelmingly in favor of its use. Not that most people were bloodthirsty or desirious of inflicting a cruel revenge, but that if it meant an end to the fighting and the anxious waiting, they supported using it. Of course, if the armed forces had been polled, the results would have been unanimous.

Another stimulus to the anxiety arose. From the very beginning of our involvement, casualties returned to civilian life, their numbers increasing as the war continued. The casualties were both psychological and physical in nature, and their difficulties in readjusting, as well as those of their families and friends, were common knowledge. But reminders of what could happen were not essential for those experiencing prolonged anxiety. The dynamics of waiting included the fear that separated people can and do change and that reunion at war's end might fall short of one's dreams. Regardless of circumstances some people manage to live in a fool's paradise, but for most people — wives, parents, older children — the reunion was seen as potentially dangerous.

I said earlier that millions of men stopped 'working' and entered the armed services. For some this represented, of course, a massive unsought interference with what they liked and wanted to do. For others, however, leaving their work was not intrinsically saddening because their work was not satisfying to them. They did not relish going to war, of course, and their reluctance had more to do with going to war than giving up interesting work. War has, as we know, perversely unexpected consequences. During the Second World War some men and women in the armed services found themselves in jobs and positions of responsibility far above or more interesting than they experienced in civilian life. We are used to hearing about the grime and tragedy of battle, and we cannot be reminded of it too often. We are also familiar with the confining routine, and Catch-22 features of military living. But the fact remains that for some people, their military work was more satisfying than their civilian work. For these people (their numbers cannot be known but I assume they were not insignificant) the return to civilian life would pose difficult problems. Similarly, those who had been wrenched away from satisfying work and whose prolonged military service was experienced as senseless futility and mind-breaking boredom would have distinctive problems of readjustment. Let us not forget probably the largest group: those who left unsatisfactory work and experienced more of the same in the military. Their problems in readjustment were undoubtedly quite varied, but it is hard to see how they could return to civilian life with a positive conception of themselves.

An army needs officers, and the size of the military establishment during the Second World War required a staggering number. Traditionally, officers tend to come from the highly educated groups of the population and the Second World War was no exception. Medical, legal, business, educational, psychological, engineering, administrative, scientific — these were only some of the kinds of personnel that were required. Many who had already finished their education and were practising their professions were drafted or volunteered for service. With the outbreak of war it seemed as if our colleges and universities would be denuded of students (and faculty), who would be drafted en masse. But as it became clear that modern war required the kinds of knowledge and expertise represented in various university departments, and that to gain a minimum level of proficiency in these fields assumed a college education (e.g., physicians and engineers could not skip college), our colleges and universities became, in part, accelerated training centers supported by the military. In fact, government support of these programs made it possible for many people to receive a college education (however narrow and accelerated) who ordinarily would not have, anticipating the GI bill. A sizable number of high school graduates who were college bound were drafted directly into the armed services, just as college students were drafted while they were still in school. Some of these people, either because they had been in college or had obtained high intelligence test scores, were sent to officer candidate schools or selected for special training programs run by the military. Indeed, a good number of these young people were exposed to jobs and career possibilities which they pursued after the war. The correlation between education and officer status was lost on no one. Occasionally, it gave rise to feelings of superiority and smugness among the educated; it very frequently was viewed with derision and hostility on the part of the less educated. Feelings aside, the significance of education in military and civilian life was established as never before.

It is hard to say how the military experiences of the highly educated soldier influenced his adjustment to civilian work. Hordes of them flocked back to the universities to finish their education or professional training, or to reorient themselves toward the future. Those who had an established profession before entering the military had the difficult task of starting all over again, a task complicated by three factors. First, the returnees felt robbed by the years spent in service; those years may have had some value and interest in terms of work, but were not likely to pay off in restarting a professional career. Second, they were aware that while they were in service those who had remained in civilian life had furthered their careers. Third, those who had remained in civilian life, however grateful they might have been to those who had been in the military, were not faced with a readjustment but with the linear pursuit of their work.

We must keep in mind that at the same time everyone was rejoicing at the war's end, they were also anticipating that our society would soon be faced with economic problems, high unemployment and social unrest. The change from a war to a peace economy has never been easy (neither for the victors, nor for the defeated), and given the length and the dimensions of the Second World War, it is not surprising that some gloomy forecasts were made. The specter of the Great Depression, during which the veterans had come to maturity, seemed to be taking shape anew on the horizon. From one depression to war to another depression? No one wanted to be on that road, but many feared they were. During the war the conflicts between industry and labor had largely been contained, but

there was good reason to believe that as soon as the war ended that struggle would erupt again. The racial problem had already gathered momentum during the war, and it certainly would gather force and speed with the end of war. So, side by side with rejoicing at the approaching end of war was anxiety about the future of self and society.

One other factor must be mentioned, and again it is an example of the perverse dialectic of war. War is hell, especially for those in or near battle whose unseen but constant companion is death. But the conditions of war, as countless novelists have told us, also produce a social cohesion, a sense of community, a special freedom in thought, language and behavior ordinarily missing in peacetime. Entry into service is an upsetting affair productive of loneliness, in which one actively seeks and needs to establish social roots. It is a socializing process in which internal and external pressures facilitate relationships and structured social living. One may experience frustration, loneliness and despair — one can count on that — but one also can count on the sense of belonging which is a product of rigid military structure with its strong formal and informal codes of behavior. Life is structured and confined far beyond what one is accustomed to or desires, but the other side of the coin is that one knows one belongs. Griping and bitching are an important feature of military living (and why not?), as are fantasies of freedom and pleasures when the war is over. However, for some soldiers the return to civilian life had some surprises, among which was a yearning for that strange amalgam of structure, freedom and social cohesion they had so long dreamed of leaving. The people and world to which they were returning had, like themselves, undergone change. In this war, unlike previous wars, our soldiers spent time in all corners of the globe in strange countries with strange customs, and some of the relationships, sexual or otherwise, they formed were not easy to give up or forget. Memories of war-time experience were no less subject to the mechanisms of selective recall than were those of the civilian life they had left.

If the years immediately after the war did not produce economic chaos, they did exacerbate or produce personal turmoil. For at least a decade after the war professional journals were full of articles about how the war helped set the stage for personal and familial conflicts. In fact, one characterization of those post-war years is as the Age of Psychology and Psychiatry. It is not fortuitous that not long after the war's end Leonard Bernstein composed the concerto *The Age of Anxiety*. The federal government had begun a massive program to care for veterans who had incurred service-connected disabilities, and a large fraction of the funds went to the development of psychiatric services. Indeed, between the Veterans Administration and, somewhat later, the National Institute of Mental Health, social science and psychiatry departments of the university were supported in regard to mental health training and research endeavors. Mental Health! One might as well characterize those post-war years as the Age of Mental Health because it became a national concern. It was not only the veteran who needed help, but, it was argued, so did millions of other people. How could we educate and train enough psychotherapists to begin to meet the demand for help? What we really needed, said one eminent psychiatrist, were more five-dollars-an-hour therapists. The most obvious significance of these developments was reflected in people's changing sense of autonomy, potency and social connectedness — the ways in which they experienced and sought solutions for personal problems.

One other obvious feature of the war years has to be noted, a feature whose

implications for the future were not comprehended. The enemy in the Second World War was fascism and racism. How could we fight such an enemy and tolerate racism in our own country? That was a question pushed to the fore by blacks who at the start of the war were largely in segregated units in the army. Both in the armed forces and civilian life this question raged, accompanied by violence and even riots. We are used to hearing about the civil rights movement after the war. The fact is that the civil rights movement, among blacks and whites, was forged during the war. If the war years presented challenges and opportunites for blacks, the same was true for women. They, too, both in the armed forces and civilian life, had assumed roles previously denied them.

It is hard to overestimate what a catastrophe the Great Depression was to most people. It caused personal turmoil, disappointment and disillusionment for which many in the older segments of our society today still carry scars. One must bear in mind that, from its beginning in 1929 until a year or so after Roosevelt's inauguration in 1933, being out of work or hungry was an individual catastrophe and not a situation for government action. Even when the federal government assumed responsibility, its programs were of the 'band-aid' variety, leaving millions of citizens, young and old, dependent, anxious and bewildered. It was not until the Second World War that the Great Depression ended. Yet throughout this period of social upheaval the bulk of the people held to the belief that the situation would change for the better. They still nurtured hope and great expectations that in the not too distant future the land of opportunity would again be fertile.

The Second World War and its immediate aftermath were further reinforcements to hope and great expectations. We were a decisive force in subduing a fascist enemy. A lasting peace seemed possible, not an ersatz one such as followed the First World War. The obvious inadequacies of the League of Nations would be replaced by a viable United Nations. Colonialism was on its way out. Peace and justice seemed inexorable forces which would overcome the international conflicts breaking out soon after the war's end.

In our own society the immediate post-war period was dominated by four developments which, over time, became intertwined. For our purposes their significance lies in their illumination of the role of great expectations in our society. The first was the population explosion, which set in motion an economic expansion requiring material and human resources to a degree which could not be adequately dealt with. More of everything was needed, and new opportunities for work and advancement escalated. The Great Depression became an item in the history books, a relic of an unstable past from which the appropriate lessons had been learned, justifying a view of a stable future. A second occurrence was the rise of the poverty, civil rights, racial and women's movements — all seeking to establish a durable foundation for their great expectations. They asked for no less than the opportunity to give expression to the great expectations which had long been their right not their reality. The third event, in point of time the first, was the passage of the Second World War GI bill, which provided new opportunities for millions of veterans. For many veterans these were educational and career opportunities which they did not envision before the war. Education as a door-opening process to personal and material advancement took on a reality it had never had before. The fourth development was the culmination of what a small minority of people in Western society had been saying for several centuries: science and technology had the potential to solve all the important human problems and to allow the realization of one's goals. This belief became general.

What science had done in the past was nothing compared to its future potential (and the problem of death was no exception: witness the research on and potentials of cryogenics). Give science its head and follow it to a heaven on earth, if not for ourselves, then for our children or their children (Sarason, 1975).

For two decades after the Second World War the philosophy of great expectations was a factor in the experience of work. As increasing numbers of people poured into our colleges and universities — exposing them to knowledge and career possibilities that had not existed before the war, inculcating in them the modern version of individual and social progress, and sensitizing them to the obligation of applying individual aspirations to the betterment of society — increasing numbers left these centers armed with hope and great expectations. Education was a door-opener to opportunity; the more education one had, the more doors would open, and widely. Gone were the days when a BA degree was a union card to a 'good job'. The dues had gone up, so to speak, and now one needed (and should want) advanced degrees for the 'really' good jobs — jobs having high status, high pay and high personal satisfactions.

It is hard to overestimate the significance of the fact that within the span of two decades increasing percentages of our population entered colleges and universities. From one standpoint it could be argued that many of these people, herded as they were onto overcrowded campuses and attending overcrowded classes, hardly received an education. Education is not a passive process in which an instructor 'puts' knowledge and wisdom 'into' the mind of the student. Nor is it a process in which teacher and student never talk with each other. The hallmark of learning is certainly not the degree to which a student can regurgitate in an examination what he has been told to read and what the instructor has said in lectures. Is it not a corruption of the traditions of a liberal arts education to transform college into a trade school? Was it justified to encourage students to seek a college education who had neither the appropriate motivations nor capacities to benefit from it? Worse yet, the argument goes on, how can one look approvingly at the proliferation of graduate degrees testifying largely to the payment of tuition? The tragedy of those years was not only that students were shortchanged, but that the function of the university to transmit and sustain the values of intellectual learning and inquiry — to 'liberate' (through the liberal arts) the minds of people and at the same time instill an appreciation of cultural continuity — was transformed and degraded. Robert Nisbet's (1971) book *The Degradation of the Academic Dogma*, represents one of the better analyses of this type of criticism. It is a bitter but not unsympathetic statement.

It is not to deny validity to these criticisms to say they becloud a most significant point: through a confluence of factors this 'land of opportunity' suddenly opened wide the doors of higher education, which had been long accepted as a sure entry into a good life. If more people entered these doors than in any other society, past or present, it was not only because the doors opened wide, adorned with enticing welcome signs, but also because it has always been part of the transmitted culture that education was an instrument for personal progress. One should always strive and expect, and the more schooling one had, the more one had a right to expect of life. The university, formerly the preserve primarily of the affluent, became more representative of the larger society. One can bemoan the untoward effects of such quick growth on the university, but one must not neglect to ask what was likely to happen to the new millions leaving our colleges and universities, armed

with hope that their experience in the world of work would confirm their great expectations.

If the philosophy of great expectations from education suggests a reaching for a desirable state of affairs, however defined, it also suggests that there is a state of affairs to be avoided. The material benefits and status to be gained through higher education have always been obvious and emphasized to a greater degree than what may be termed intrinsic benefits — that is, the increased understanding of, and fascination with, culture and history, a perception of self-growth in regard to such understanding and a never-ending sense of wonder about man and his works, possibilities and dilemmas. Through education one not only hoped to become a 'better' person, but also to acquire interests and a style of thinking which would forever enrich one's life. These intrinsic, hard-to-define benefits were like a good diet: somehow they sustained one against debilitation, or at least they kept at bay some of the more insidious influences which make life difficult or unbearable. But there was little question that the most obvious benefit of higher education was that it led to a smorgasbord of career opportunities from which one could choose according to interests and talents, and one could expect one's choice to provide income over time to meet one's expectations. Material expectations varied considerably among the different career possibilities, but in no instance did one expect to find living an economic struggle. The public school teacher obviously expected less income than did the physician, but until recent years teaching was considered a noble and obviously important profession. If those who entered teaching were inadequately remunerated, the discrepancy between what they received and what they felt they deserved was far from enormous, and presumably there were other benefits which took the edge off the consequences of the discrepancy.

It is a mistake in emphasis to criticize our colleges and universities as having become elevated forms of trade schools, pandering to materialistic students who tend to lack intellectual curiosity and appreciation of the intrinsic benefits of a higher education. From the traditional perspective of the faculties of the arts and sciences the criticism is by no means without foundation. From the perspective of many students any aspect of their education must meet the criterion of 'relevance' for their future careers, and not many aspects do. The mistake in emphasis is one of insensitivity to the fact that at the basis of students' thinking was a distinction no less significant for its unclear articulation: the distinction was between labor and work. To labor is to be imprisoned in activity in which outcome or product has no personally meaningful relationship to the person's capactities and individuality, e.g., the assembly-line worker, garbage collector, pencil-pushing clerk or the 'organizational drone'. To work is to have one's outcome and product bear the stamp of one's capacities and individuality. To labor is to be stamped by the activity; to work is to put one's stamp on the activity. Work, in Dewey's terms, contains the promise of an experience. Labor is devoid of such a possibility.

To deny that our society is one in which size of income and material possessions are criteria of 'success' is lunacy. The great expectations which have long been part of our ideology are largely defined in economic terms. It is not surprising, therefore, that following the Second World War, when millions of young people were able to obtain a higher education — during two decades of societal affluence in which advances in speed of communication and travel redefined the scope and substance of the good life — they saw education as ensuring some access to that good life. The society not only told them to

expect, it told them what to expect. But that was never the whole story, because in some vague, inchoate way most of these young people were expecting their careers to have the characteristics of work and not labor. They may have left our colleges and universities seeking the highest bidder for their knowledge and skills; they may have chosen their first job because they could quickly move up the economic and status ladders; they may have gone on spending sprees for new homes, cars, TV sets and other accoutrements of gracious living; and they may have easily cottoned to the presumably painless use of bank loans and credit cards — may have entered the world of work in all of these ways, but it is a mistake to conclude that they expected work to be an unfulfilling experience, a personal trap in which individuality and potentiality were the major victims.

I have deliberately restricted my comments to the two decades after the Second World War because most of that period has been characterized as somnolent, silent and smug. Certainly most of that period lacked the sustained overt emotionalism and upheaval of succeeding years. That turbulence did not begin on a certain day or in a particular year. Like all social upheavals, this one had its roots in the near and distant past. We think of the Second World War as turbulent, but the turbulence conjured up in our minds took place on battlefields, on the seas and in distant lands. We tend not to think of the forces set into motion within our society, forces which began to alter that society radically, such as accelerated migration to industrial centers, new job opportunities for women and racial and ethnic minorities, an emerging civil rights movement (particularly in regard to segregation in the armed forces), rising affluence, mammoth disruption in family life, the setting of the stage for the future population explosion and the beginning awareness that the post-war period was not and should not be a return to the good old days. If we thought of the two decades after the war as silent and conformist, it is because we had no way of comprehending the significance of the availability of higher education to millions of young people. We were too busy enlarging and creating colleges and universities, too busy searching for faculties to man them, too busy following up the wondrous scientific and technological advances spurred by the Second World War, to examine how this revolution in opportunity reflected past traditions and public rhetoric and what kind of harbinger it might be for different kinds of scenarios in the future. I do not say this in criticism. If we were unprepared to deal adequately with the problem in a logistical and architectural sense, we were even less prepared to deal with its social history, institutional implications and changing zeitgeist. It has been pointed out that national revolutions occur after rising expectations have been blunted. I am suggesting that the upheaval (not revolution) of the last decade stemmed in part from the earlier remarkable increase in the numbers of young people populating our colleges and universities. It was not only that they came in unprecedented numbers, but that they came with attitudes toward and expectations of our society which they had little or no reason to believe were unrealistic — until, of course, their later entry into that society changed their view of that society.

The GI Bill of Rights — of whose many generous provisions at least half of the fifteen million participants in the war took advantage — was the single most potent stimulus to and reinforcement of the theme of great expectations. When that legislation is seen in the context of the Great Depression, the war years and the decade or so after the war, you begin to see why great expectations were on a collision course with the realities of this society in an unstable world.

The changed nature of the relationship between education and work, between great expectations and events in the post-Second World War period, I have discussed in my book, *Work, Aging, and Social Change: Professionals and the One-Life, One Career Imperative* (1977), from which some of the contents of this chapter were taken. If I have gone back over some of that ground, it was with the purpose of illustrating how schools of education neglected to examine the implications and consequences of a piece of legislation that, indirectly but extraordinarily powerfully, came to influence all of public education. That legislation was primarily for and about higher education but in the light of its significance for the millions who took advantage of its provisions (significance for the individual, marriage and parenthood) it could have been predicted that the fantastic importance they gave to education for themselves and their children — in a world they perceived as having changed, a world they strongly felt should change, a world which they hoped their children would shape far more than they had been able to shape theirs — was a predisposing force to the later call for altering and improving our schools. The world had changed and *should* change — that was obvious to almost every adult, veteran or not, and it was a message communicated in myriad ways to their children. Our schools did not hear or misinterpreted the message.

A critic could ask: why blame schools of educations for not studying the consequences of the GI Bill of *Rights*, the title already reflecting the future, more general emphasis in our society on rights over obligations, on novelty and change over trading and conformity, on expectations over compromise. Would it not be more appropriate and respectful of scholarly domains to direct your remarks to the social sciences? On numerous occasions I have expressed the opinion that it is scandalous that the social sciences have virtually ignored the significance of the GI Bill of Rights. But, as you well know, the enamorment of the social sciences with grand theorizing and rigorous, but too often trivial, research had little or no place for the field of education, higher and lower. That is why, as I discussed in *Psychology Misdirected* (1981), the social sciences in general, and psychology in particular, have not been able to come to grips with John Dewey, whom they regard as at best a philosopher and at worst an educator. The lesson in all of this for schools of education is that they should not have relied on the social sciences to be sensitive to social events and forces that would have an impact on our schools. That is a responsibility that schools of education must take on far more extensively than they have in the past. The past is a puzzle and the future is essentially unknowable except in broad outline. Nevertheless, as members of a university we justify our existence by persevering in trying to reduce the past's puzzle-like features and trying to make the best guess we can about what in the future we should begin to adapt to. That means that we have to learn to be more sensitive to present events, not only in terms of appearances but also of the underswells they may be reflecting. Recently a number of books have appeared summarizing and trying to make sense of the 1980 census data. Some fascinating possibilities have been discerned in those data, almost every one of which would, if the trends continue, have an important impact on our schools. Needless to say, I am not aware that anyone is trying to figure out what each of these possibilities should mean for how our conception of schools and schooling may have to change. In *Schooling in America: Scapegoat and Salvation* (1983), from a vantage point other then census data, I have interpreted ongoing social changes in ways that forced me to conclude that the axiom that education

best takes place inside schools is largely invalid. I note this here only to suggest that the most potent enemy within us is the tendency to scan the scene of social change imprisoned intellectually within the structure and traditions of educational institutions into which we were socialized and with which we continue to be related — institutions from which most of us derive our livelihood in whole or in part. Once we recognize that enemy and begin to cope with it we will be better prepared for a future that is rushing toward us.

Let me now turn to a second aspect on my uninvited challenge to schools of education.

This aspect of the challenge, again put in terms of the past, stems from the fact that educators not only accepted responsibility for schooling but, more fateful, adopted a stance which essentially said: we know how to solve and manage the problems of schooling in America. Educators did not say: there is much that we do not know, many problems that are intractable to our efforts and many individuals we are not reaching or helping. Put in another way, educators were not saying out loud that which in their daily work was obvious to them. Yes, they would say, we need more financial and other resources which, if made available, would improve education. That is why when in the late 1950s and early 1960s the federal government began to provide additional resources, it seemed to educators as if they were at the start of a new era in which they could really deliver on past promises. Of course, the public looked eagerly to what seemed a rosy future. There were, needless to say, controversies about how to use the new resources, what should be changed and who should be changed. But no one was saying that those debates should be intepreted as indicating either that we were far from clear about what the problems were or that we had any solid ground for believing that any particular idea or practice would work as its proponents said. There were answers galore, a surfeit of promises, and it was understandable if the public gained the impression that the problems of schooling were like problems in mathematics in that they had clear answers. Matters were not helped by educational critics and researchers, largely in our universities, who said not only that the emperor was naked, but also that he was suffering from a terminal disease. They, with a few exceptions, did not say that the problems of schooling were long-standing and not amenable to quick remedies; that past emperors in the research community had misled them; that, actuarially speaking, most research being proposed would turn out to be, at best, fruitless and, at worst, harmful in its side effects; that the research endeavor, however necessary, is no basis for devising timetables and communicating unjustified optimism; that the researcher, like the educational practitioner, wrestles with unknowns, trying to do his or her best with extroardinarily complex problems. Like the practitioners, the educational researchers promised the public more than they could deliver, implicity suggesting a timetable that was wildly unrealistic. Far from seeing their kinship with the practitioner, the educational researcher tended to use the practitioner as scapegoat. All of this was taking place at the same time that both researcher and practitioner knew in their hearts that they were seeking their ways through a forest of ignorance that seemed to grow trees faster than they could be cut down.

Let me make my point by analogy. Why is it that since the rise of scientific medicine in the latter half of the nineteenth century, we have not criticized and indicted the medical researcher and practitioner for not being able to cure the bulk of cancers — or, for that matter, hundreds of other bodily afflictions? Why was it not said that medicine was either

a failure or quackery that did not deserve public support? One part of the answer is that the medical community made a virtue of its ignorance insofar as its stance with the public was concerned. That community did not say that it would be able to cure cancers next year or twenty years from now. On the contrary, it emphasized the complexity and scope of the problem, the inadequacies of past and present conceptions and practices, the false starts and disappointments that await it and the public in the future, and the need for patience, forebearance and the long-term view. In short, scientific medicine said: we will do our best, we will try to learn; let us not underestimate the obstacles and conundrums we face.

This stance may not be the polar opposite of how the educational community has presented itself to the public, but it comes uncomfortably close. Why this has been and continues to be the case is beyond my present purpose which is to emphasize that, to the extent that the educational community does not alter its stance, it is doomed. That stance will not be altered without the leadership of our schools of education. I am not suggesting that we compose a symphony of *mea culpas* in which the major theme is ignorance and the supporting chords are dysphoria and hopelessness. Nor am I suggesting that we change our stance only in order to obtain and increase the support of our various educational enterprises. The primary aim of this aspect of the challenge is twofold: first, to get the educational community off the moral hook of promising more than it can deliver; second, to increase public understanding of why the problems of schooling in our society are and will be as vexing as they are. Implicit in this altered stance is a very important message: no longer will the educational community accept full responsibility for dealing with educational problems, most of which by their very nature are exacerbated by forces beyond the school. That is not to say that educators will not deal with these problems as they manifest themselves in our schools, that educators will not try to seek better approaches, but rather that these problems will be intractable as long as they are seen as the primary responsibility of educators. Just as the medical community does not accept responsibility for cancers caused by smoking, pollution, food additives and scores of other possible carcinogens, the educational community cannot accept responsibility for problems originating in the larger society. Just as the medical community continues to deal clinically as best it can with etiological factors over which it has no control, so must the educational community do its best with problems beyond its control in the sense of prevention. Schools of education must assume leadership in relationship to diverse community groups and institutions, in a way that makes clear that responsibility is shared. As I have said elsewhere (Sarason, 1982), for all practical purposes the answer to the question, 'Who owns the schools?' has been: educators. However understandable that was in terms of seeking professional status and of community compliance, it was a disastrous mistake, confusing leadership with shared responsibility.

I said earlier that these are dangerous times for schools of education precisely because education has returned near to the top of the national agenda. For one thing the critics of education are again making scapegoats of educators as if the major problems are their responsibility and of their making; and proposals for change continue to assume that in the future this responsibility should remain where it is. I hear nothing from the educational community to challenge that assignment of responsibility. Therein is the danger that the proposed nostrums will be seen by the public, the ultimate victims, as 'answers'. Who is saying that we are not dealing with problems that have 'solutions' in the sense that four

divided by two is two? Who is saying that however wondrous available technology may be (like the computer), we are far from knowing how technology can or should be employed in a school, that it is not simply a matter of engineering technology into the classroom? (Is amnesia about the promise of teaching machines, the new math, the new biology and the new physics total?) Who is saying that any effort at educational change, like the trials for a new drug, has to be concerned with 'side effects', indeed has to assume that there will be undesirable side effects which can be of a degree with will cause us to abort our efforts? Who is saying that we should never undertake any educational change or innovation unless there is a *general* recognition that we may fail outright or fall short of the mark, not because we lack confidence in what we will do but because we are realistic about the limitations of our knowledge, theoretical and practical, in an unpredictable world? The silence on these issues is, for all practical purposes, complete.

The third aspect of the challenge concerns the relationship of schools of education to the public schools. More than a decade ago, in relation to a partial critique of the social sciences (Sarason, 1974), I made the recommendation that any social scientist whose writing and research purported to have significance for how things do or should work in a particular setting should be encouraged (originally, I said required!) to spend every third year, full-time, in that setting in some appropriate position. That recommendation arose from my observations of many academic social scientists who in the 1960s earnestly strove to make a difference somewhere in society, most frequently in Washington. They strove to make a difference in two ways: as consultants or by taking a position during leave of absence from the university. With very few exceptions they came back to the universities psychologically bloodied: discouraged by their lack of influence, appalled by what they had seen or experienced, uncomprehending of why the social world had not already come apart, and grateful that they could return to the groves of the academy where, relatively speaking, peace and rationality reigned and the pursuit of knowledge was the prime virtue. Their world was divided in two: inside and outside the university, and guess which one they thought to be askew? I am overdrawing the picture only somewhat, but that should not distract you from the fact that most of these social scientists were forced to become aware that their theories and research were not applicable to the world as it is, as they experience it outside the university. Indeed, Patrick Moynihan, a one-time academic, was so impressed with the feckless efforts of social scientists that in his book, *Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding* (1969), he recommends that the arena of social policy should be considered off-limits to them and that their role should be restricted to evaluation, not planning, consulting about or administering policy. Moynihan's recommendation is, as I point out in *The Psychological Sense of Community* (1974, p. 257), as mindless as the theories and research which were the objects of his criticisms were inadequate.

I have been discussing the social scientist ... he pursues social action for the purpose of applying basic theory to the solution of the problems of society. There is a second way, far less ambitious and more unplanned or fortuitous, which can be illustrated by Second World War experiences. It first has to be noted that in the Second World War almost everyone in the university willingly and eagerly sought to be helpful. No one was saying that the rest of society should fight the war while the university should continue its pursuit of basic knowledge. Academic people in or out of the armed services concentrated on practical problems in which they frequently had no background or previous interest. They

were not seeking basic knowledge or developing new theoretical systems. The problems were immediate, pressing and in need of practical solutions. Overcoming visual problems of pilots, instilling certain attitudes in soldiers, managing mental breakdowns near the field of battle, learning how to form groups and maintain morale, teaching of heretofore neglected foreign languages, increasing industrial efficiency and output, developing effective propaganda, training people for espionage, predicting reactions to stress, improving decision-making and planning processes — this is a very small sample of the problems academic people were dealing with. The war had personal and professional consequences for university people, personal in the sense that for many it simply expanded their knowledge of the larger society and its problems, and professional in the sense that it changed the substantive nature of many fields. It is hard to overestimate how much the Second World War changed the direction of basic research and theory because it was an unpredictable consequence of dealing with some practical or applied problems. Garner (1972) discussed and illustrated this process in regard to experimental psychology.

> The topic of space perception is almost synonymous with the name of James Gibson these days, so when I want to talk about concepts and research in space perception, I cannot do so without talking about James Gibson's research. He was well established as an authority on perception before World War II, but his experiences during that war working on some applied problems, changed the nature and direction of his theorizing considerably. Specifically, his experiences led him to his 'Ground Theory' of space perception as described in his book, *The Perception of the Visual World*, published in 1950.
>
> As Gibson describes the experience in that book, he and some other psychologists were trying to understand how aircraft pilots estimate the distance to the ground when they are landing an airplane. He found that the traditional cues for depth perception, listed without fail in every introductory textbook on psychology, simply failed to explain the perception of depth at the distances required in flying and landing an airplane. He furthermore found that experiments had to be done in the field to get at the process, that laboratory experiments changed the nature of the process too much. So into the field he went.
>
> It was from these experiments that Gibson came to the conclusion that the prerequisite for the perception of space is the perception a continuous background surface; thus the 'Ground Theory' which evolved from this work.
>
> The important point for my thesis today is that Gibson's whole way of thinking about the problem of space perception changed when he was faced with the problem of understanding how pilots in a real-life situation actually land their airplanes without too many crashes. His theoretical notions were changed by his contact with people with problems. He did not develop these important ideas by a continuous relation to his previous work. Rather, his research and thinking, according to his own report, took a decided turn for the better as a result of his experience (pp. 8–9).

Garner could have used his own illustrious career as an example.

It is unfortunate that it was as a consequence of a world war that theory and research

in practically every university discipline changed markedly and the pace of acquiring new knowledge accelerated. The lesson, of course, is not that we should have more wars but that concern with practical problems can lead to new and fundamental knowledge. But this lesson was not drawn, so that in 1972 Garner was compelled to say: 'The quality of basic research is improved by communication between the basic research scientist and the people who have problems to solve. Thus for scientists to engage in goal-oriented research, research aimed at solving problems known to exist, is both to perform a service to society and to improve the quality of basic research itself . . . If the scientist will talk to people with real problems, and just as important, if those people will talk to those of us who are scientists, then both those who acquire knowledge and those who apply it will benefit. The relation is truly symbiotic.

I should remind the reader that the thrust of my discussion has not been to deny the validity of the tradition that holds that research and theorizing untrammeled by practical considerations, or the need to solve immediate social problems, can contribute new general knowledge about man and society. I have argued against the exclusivity of this tradition and its historically unwarranted assumption that dealing with the practical problems of people and society is dangerous and unproductive. I hope that it has also been clear that I have not advocated that the academic social scientist should become involved in practical matters as an end in itself but rather as a means of testing his comprehension of social realities or for the deliberate purpose of experiencing a new role in its actual fullness.

I must turn again to personal experience. One of several major reasons why I started and directed the Yale Psycho-Educational Clinic was to test myself in the role of leader. It was an inchoate kind of motivation but in some dim way I felt I had to do it if I were to understand better why new settings fail, and rather quickly so. I was painfully aware of the self-defeating character of most organizations, new and old, but I was vaguely uncomfortable in the knowledge that my understanding was from an outsider's perspective. And, frankly, the literature I read on leadership and organizations was far more effective than seconal as a sleep producer. I also found what was for me a fantastic omission in this literature: there was practically nothing on how to create a new setting, even though new settings were being created at an ever-accelerating rate. The more I dug into the literature, the clearer it became that what information we have is based on chronologically mature, malfunctioning organizations. So in my curiosity about myself as a leader I was led to the problem of the creation of settings, which I defined as two or more people coming together in new and sustained relationships to attain stated objectives. As best I could, it is all described in my book, *The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies* (1972). I experienced leadership and the creation of settings in their fullness. I would like to believe that the things I learned and reported are fundamental and a contribution to general knowledge. What I believe is ultimately of no significance unless others agree that what came out of ten years of planning and working — ten years of continuous, day-by-day, month-by-month responsibility, influencing and being influenced, experiencing anxiety, joy and controversy — is of general import. If that book was a biography of a particular clinic in a particular university in a particular city, I should not be surprised if it met with disinterest. What may be interesting to me, or what was the most self-transforming experience of my life, is important to me personally, but unless I can relate the particulars of my experiences to more general contents and issues I am not fulfilling my role as a

member of a university faculty. The most pertinent point here is that as a member of a university faculty I had an obligation to pursue knowledge even if that meant 'messing' in a sustained way with the realities of modern society. But, as I pointed out before, that sense of obligation is not shared by many people in the university, who have successfully innoculated themselves against the contamination of society.

I have reiterated what I wrote years ago in relation to social scientists because I feel that my critique and recommendation should have even greater force for the faculty of our schools of education. Visiting schools is fine, there is nothing wrong with giving workshops, and consulting to schools can be instructive, but none of these, or all of them in combination, can substitute for implementing and testing one's theories and research findings on a full-time basis in the setting for which they are deemed appropriate. Let me bolster my argument by saying something critical about one of my great heroes, John Dewey. As you well know, John Dewey sought to change and improve our schools but, as you also know, schools took over his rhetoric but avoided giving life to his ideas. Why this happened is a long story and I refer you to Cremin's (1961) *The Transformation of the School* and Hofstadter's (1964) *Anti-Intellectualism in America*. There is one part of the explanation that has not been noted and it is wrapped up in the question: Why did Dewey start the lab school at the University of Chicago at the end of the last century? There were, I believe, three major reasons. The first was Dewey's need to have a vehicle through which he could test his ideas — the experimental attitude always characterized his approach. Foremost in his purpose was to wed psychology to education; he was drawn to Chicago precisely because he would have the support to overcome the artificial separation between the two fields. Indeed, a few years after he started the lab school he stated in his 1899 presidential address to the American Psychological Association that education had to be conceptualized within the context of the social sciences, a position that, as I shall indicate at the end of my remarks, has special significance for the distinctive history of Syracuse's School of Education. The second reason was Dewey's interest in child development. Dewey way back then was already fashioning conceptions that were remarkably similar to those that Piaget came to decades later.

We have yet to appreciate fully the legacy of what Dewey did and learned in his lab school. But what Dewey did not see — he saw almost everything else — was the difference between creating your own school and changing an existing one. Dewey's third purpose was to use the lab school as a force for changing our existing schools and school systems. Dewey did a magnificent job in creating, inspiring and overseeing an atypical educational setting, but that is a different order of task than trying to implement ideas in what I have called the culture of existing schools (1982). Dewey, of course, was as astute an observer as there has ever been of our schools, but his astuteness (a word that indulges understatement in his case) did not extend to the obstacle course one runs when trying to introduce change into an ongoing institution rooted in history and tradition. To comprehend and cope with that task would have required Dewey to immerse himself in the change process in 'real life' schools. That is the degree of full-time immersion that is all too rare among faculty in schools of education and in the social sciences. Our phenomenology of schools in relation to the change process is dramatically altered once we assume a full-time role in the quotidian activities of schools, and it is a process that always has an impact on our theories and goals.

My argument can be illustrated by a brief comment on one of those rare full-time immersions undertaken by Dean Burton Blatt. I refer to the year Dean Blatt spent away from Boston University to become Deputy Commissioner for Mental Retardation in Massachusetts. What he learned and experienced is contained in his book, *Exodus from Pandemonium* (1970). I especially recommend the chapter titled 'Fifteen Ashburton Place', the central office then of the Department of Mental Health. This chapter is realistic, unsettling and wisely humorous. He took that position after his photographic essay, *Christmas in Purgatory* (1966), awakened this nation to the inhumanity in our 'humane' institutions. In fact, he communicated his findings to the assembled Massachusetts legislature, reporting much the same state of affairs that Dorothea Dix had to the same legislature more than a century earlier. Dean Blatt wanted to be a force for changing and improving institutions in our states and he took a leave of absence from the university to become such a force. Paradoxically, but only so on the surface, he became such a force at the same time that he began to question his basic assumption that it was possible to bring about sustained change in these institutions. The realities of the system and our society, he came to conclude, would prevent accomplishing such sustained change. The loss of innocence is much to be preferred to the consequences of theorizing or hortatory rhetoric divorced from the realities. From one standpoint, as he noted, he failed in his purposes because he was in part responsible for many states spending many millions of dollars to improve what could not be improved except over very short periods of time. But in one enormously significant respect his efforts, together with one other earlier event in our society, had major roles in bringing about the third revolution in American education. The first revolution was the legitimation of compulsory education. The second, and this is the earlier event I alluded to, was the desegregation decision of 1954. That decision and Dean Blatt's awakening this country to the moral issues involved in maintaining segregated institutions were in part responsible for the third revolution embodied in Public Law 94-142, a law intended to change every school and institution in our society. I have to point out that neither in our schools of education nor in our social science departments was there sensitivity to the potential interconnections between the desegregation decision in relation to schools and what Dean Blatt was describing in our institutions, many of which dignified themselves by appropriating the appellation 'schools'. Public Law 94-142 might well have come about if Dean Blatt had never done or written what he did. But the fact that he did what he did — immersing himself in a total way in a responsible position in the ongoing social world — hastened a process that needed hasteners.

I am not asserting that every member of a school of education needs to leave the university to spend a meaningful period of time in a meaningful position. What I have recommended is that those members whose theories and research purport to describe the realities of our schools, or contain clear proposals for what schools should do or be, should be encouraged to test their ideas in the setting for which they are presumably relevant. There are, of course, faculty members for whom my recommendation does not hold; here I use as illustration Professor Thomas Green. His two books, *Work, Leisure and the American Schools* (1980) and *Predicting the Behavior of the Educational System* (1968) are remarkable not only because of the way in which Green probes beneath the surfaces of our society, but also because of the tightly reasoned arguments that literally force you to think differently about our society and our schools. Green does not tell you how to act

differently or what program you should mount, but rather why you have to think differently than you have been accustomed to.

References

BLATT, D.B. (1966) *Christmas in Purgatory*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

BLATT, D.B. (1970) *Exodus from Pandemonium*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

CREMIN, L. (1961) *The Transformation of the School*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

GARNER, W. (1972) The Acquisition and Application of Knowledge. A Symbiotic Relationship. *American Psychologist*, 27: 10.

GREEN, T. (1968) *Work, Leisure, and the American Schools*. New York: Syracuse University Press.

GREEN, T. (1980) *Predicting the Behavior of the Educational System*. New York: Random House.

HOFSTADTER, R. (1964) *Anti-Intellectualism in America*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

MOYNIHAN, P. (1969) *Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding*. New York: Free Press.

NISBET, R. (1971) *The Degradation of the Academic Dogma*. New York: Basic Books.

SARASON, S.B. (1972) *The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies*. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass.

SARASON, S.B. (1974) *The Psychological Sense of Community. Prospects for a Community Psychology*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

SARASON, S.B. (1975) 'Psychology to the Finland Station in the Heavenly City of the Eighteenth Century Philosophers,' *American Psychologist*, 30, (11), 1072–80.

SARASON, S.B. (1977) *Work, Aging, and Social Change: Professionals and the One Life-One Career Imperative*. New York: Free Press.

SARASON, S.B. (1981) *Psychology Misdirected*. New York: Free Press.

SARASON, S.B. (1982) *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*. 2nd ed. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

SARASON, S.B. (1983) *Schooling in America: Scapegoat and Salvation*. New York: Free Press.

PART II

Examining Critical Issues of Fundamental Change

Chapter 4

A Fundamental Puzzle of School Reform*

Larry Cuban

Tough-talking federal and state policy-makers active in current school reforms have consistently charged that, while schools did their jobs well at some earlier date, misguided reformers have since caused standards to slip, student performance to decay and schooling to become ineffective. Schools, they argue, have changed for the worse.

The copycat spread of state reforms intended to stiffen academic standards, raise teacher pay and tighten the assessment of teachers depends on the pervasiveness of this view of a decline in the quality of schooling. The current crop of changes, state policy-makers claim, will improve what occurs in classrooms and schools and right the wrongs of the past. Set aside the vocabulary of crisis and the clever images of rising tides of mediocrity, however, and few of these aggressive cheerleaders for current reforms could say that the governance of schools, the ways teachers teach or the organizational structures of schooling have substantially changed over the last century.

The graded school with self-contained classrooms, the sorting of students by age and the division of the curriculum into grade-level chunks were all innovations introduced to American schools in the mid-nineteenth century. A superintendent in every district, a principal in every school and a teacher in every classroom were familiar fixtures to turn-of-the-century taxpayers. Teachers' reliance on textbooks, worksheets and homework was already standard practice in early twentieth century classrooms. Despite the rhetoric of reform, basic ways of schooling children have been remarkably durable over the last hundred years.

How can it be, then, that so much school reform has taken place over the last century yet schooling appears to be pretty much the same as it has always been?[1] Such a contradiction — long-term stability amid constant change — puzzles well intentioned policy-makers, practitioners and researchers eager to improve schooling. But it is essential that those same policy-makers and practitioners try to make sense of this contradiction. This chapter offers some views on reform and the process of change and connects these views to a fundamental puzzle of school reform.

* This chapter draws on the author's *The Managerial Imperative: The Practice of Leadership in Schools* (Albany: New York State University Press, 1988).

Change versus Progress

Change is not necessarily improvement. Most Americans see change as positive. Yet change may or may not be progress. When a divorce splits a husband and wife, one partner may see the pain and loss as an opportunity to begin a new life, a chance for personal growth, an improvement over the past; the other may view the split as a disaster. How we look at change depends on our goals and our mental map. An example related to schools might help clarify the point.

A century and a half ago tax-supported common schools took in boys and girls from cities and farms, as well as migrants and immigrants. Buildings were erected; teachers were hired; the school year was lengthened; more children attended classes and graduated; children from many different cultures shared the same classrooms. These changes aimed to improve a growing, maturing system of public schooling.

To some people these planned changes or reforms appeared to be progress toward a better fit between democracy and the schooling that children received. In the eyes of other observers, however, these changes were seen as efforts by an élite class to shape the beliefs, values and behavior of children to meet the social and economic needs of those in power. In this view the innovations of nineteenth century schooling are seen not as improvements but as impositions of the powerful upon the weak — as forms of social control. The judgment of whether a change is an improvement, then, rests in the mind of the beholder.

Two Kinds of Planned Change

If change is not necessarily progress, and if there is more than one kind of change, then we need to examine what kinds of planned change there are. There are at least two types of reform: first-order and second-order change.[2] Let me use a sad example to illustrate what I mean by each.

In 1986 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) experienced grave setbacks with the tragic destruction of the Challenger space shuttle and of two unmanned rockets within a three-month period. By all accounts, an agency that had soared with the successes of lunar landings, shuttle flights and space walks staggered to a halt with the deaths of seven astronauts and two rocket failures. With public awareness of a complete collapse in performance, the Presidential commission appointed to investigate the disasters and NASA's new leadership were forced to define the problems clearly. In engineering terms the commission had to determine whether the Challenger accident was a design problem, a lapse in quality control or some mixture of the two. Defining the problem accurately was crucial, since the definition would chart the direction of changes in NASA's goals, formal structure and relationships with government contractors and Congress.

Similarly, for issues facing schools, there is a need to determine whether problems should be seen as design or quality control issues (or some combination of the two). For schools, solutions to what engineers would call quality control problems — improving the efficiency and effectiveness of what is done — I call *first-order* changes. First-order changes in schools would include recruiting better teachers and administrators, raising salaries,

allocating resources equitably, selecting better textbooks, adding (or deleting) content and coursework, scheduling people and activities more efficiently and introducing new versions of evaluation and training. First-order changes try to make what already exists more efficient and more effective, without disturbing the basic organizational features, without substantially altering the ways in which adults and children perform their roles. Those who propose first-order changes believe that the existing goals and structures of schooling are both adequate and desirable.

What engineers would call solutions to design problems, I call *second-order* changes. Second-order changes seek to alter the fundamental ways in which organizations are put together. They reflect major dissatisfactions with present arrangements. Second-order changes introduce new goals, structures and roles that transform familiar ways of doing things into new ways of solving persistent problems.[3] Specific examples of second-order changes are the open classroom, a voucher plan, teacher-run schools and schools in which the local community has authority to make budgetary and curricular decisions. Each of these reforms attempts fundamentally to alter existing authority, roles and uses of time and space.

Since the turn of the century, successful school reform — that is, changes that have been incorporated into the routine operations of schools — has generally been a series of first-order changes. On occasion particular second-order reforms have been attempted in uncoordinated fashion. Such innovations as student-centered instruction, non-graded schools, team teaching and open-space architecture have been tried but have had little enduring effect except in cases in which individual teachers and principals have selectively adapted them to local conditions.

The last three decades offer many examples of first-order changes sponsored by state and federal laws. The National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 spent billions of dollars and produced a number of changes in the schools:

> new layers of program specialists who pull children out of classes to receive additional help, such as reading experts, Chapter 1 teachers, bilingual education teachers and vocational education staff;
>
> procedural changes that guarantee due process for handicapped students;
>
> classification systems for categorizing children (limited English speaking, gifted and handicapped) and for certifying teachers (as teachers of English as a second language, of the gifted, of the learning disabled); and
>
> expanded testing to measure student performance.[4]

These changes altered existing rules, modified practices or led to the hiring of specialized staff members. The reforms created new constituencies that could be easily monitored, but the changes seldom dented existing organizational structures. Nor did these federal efforts substantially modify the curriculum or classroom instruction. No such changes were sought, and few occurred.

In those years federal policy-makers tried to guarantee equal access to schooling rather than to transform the structures, roles and relationships within states, districts and schools. The first-order changes that were achieved were far from trivial. Expanding access and

opportunity for children who had been poorly served by the schools was a massive task and one that was consistent with the overall goals of a democracy.

The changes that resulted from federal interventions have been replaced in the 1980s by activist state governments that have moved to fill the vacuum created by the Reagan Administration's attempts to reduce the federal role in school affairs. State after state has introduced omnibus reform bills aimed at getting teachers and students to work harder in classrooms. Governors, legislators and superintendents have mandated a longer school day (and more days in the school year), higher graduation requirements, more tests and tighter connections between tests and what is taught. Furthermore, many states have legislated higher entry-level salaries for teachers, merit pay schemes, competency tests for new and veteran teachers and accountability schemes that both caress and slap the schools. Most of these state reforms aim for quality control. They seek to make the existing system more productive, not to disturb basic classroom roles or the governance structures of schools. The historic design of public schooling instituted in the urban schools of the mid-nineteenth century remains essentially intact. Three decades of federal and state intervention have been heavily loaded toward first-order changes that have strengthened the existing structures of schooling.

Making Sense of Contradictions

Let me tie together these distinctions about change, and let me try to make sense of the riddle with which this chapter began: how can schooling have changed so much over the last century yet still appear much the same as it has always been?

Part of the contradiction depends on one's frame of reference. Change may be a continuous process, but notions of improvement reside in the heads of participants and observers. One viewer may judge a reform to be an improvement, while another judges that same change to be a step backward. Although this distinction between change and improvement is enlightening, it still does not account for the durability that we find in the governance, pedagogy and structure of schooling. The distinction between first- and second-order changes helps to explain this puzzle.

Recall that a number of second-order reforms established the dominant structures of schooling between the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The self-contained classroom, the graded curriculum, the fifty-minute period, frequent testing, the reliance on textbooks and worksheets and the current governance structure of schools were once reforms that have since become institutional benchmarks of what constitutes proper schooling. Since the turn of the century, periodic efforts to make changes in the schools have succeeded if they enhanced these structural elements. For example, such changes as different textbooks, new courses and new tests; more time in school; higher teacher salaries; compensatory education; and new procedures to gain equity for students all succeeded to a greater or lesser extent because they were essentially first-order changes. They aimed to improve the quality of what already existed — what had come to be called traditional schooling — and not to alter the existing organizational structures. In effect, first-order reforms reinforced traditional structures and gave further legitimacy to existing school practices. Schools did change, but they remained fundamentally the same.

Not surprisingly, many reforms that were intended to alter the fundamental structures of schooling met with little, if any, success. Consider student-centered instruction, open-space architecture, non-graded schools, team teaching, the widespread use of audiovisual technology, programmed learning, differentiated staffing, flexible scheduling and other erratically introduced reforms. Some of these reforms have succeeded in altering the vocabulary used by policy-makers and practitioners. Some have significantly influenced the content of journals and the agendas of conferences. Some have even, on occasion, altered professional curricula. But these reforms have seldom found a permanent home in the classrooms and schools of the nation. Indeed, most were adapted to fit the contours of existing classrooms. For example, from child-centered progressivism there remains a residue of field trips, the use of small group discussions and a patina of informality in teacher-student relationships.

Most reforms foundered on the rocks of flawed implementation. Many were diverted by the quiet but persistent resistance of teachers and administrators who, unconvinced by the unvarnished cheer of reformers, saw minimal gain and much loss in embracing second-order reforms boosted by those who were unfamiliar with the classroom as a workplace. Thus first-order changes succeeded, while second-order changes were either adapted to fit what existed or sloughed off, allowing the system to remain essentially untouched. The ingredients change, the Chinese saying goes, but the soup remains the same.

Reframing the Problem

As a veteran practitioner turned professor wrestling with this puzzle, I have come to appreciate the fact that organizations have plans for dealing with reformers. I have also found that defining problems carefully at the outset is far more important than generating clever solutions to ill-defined problems. My distinctions about change are not the only ones that could be made, nor are they necessarily the most significant. However, they do provide me with a language to understand the persistent reappearance of reforms. Let me apply my view of change and continuity to the most common goal of school reform over the past century: changing teacher behavior.

The inventory of efforts aimed at changing what teachers do in their classrooms staggers the observer. Reformers, however, have seldom asked the basic questions: How do teachers teach? What is constant and what has changed in their teaching? Why do they teach as they do? Instead, reformers desperately seeking improvement jump to the question: How *should* teachers teach? But in doing so, reform-minded policy-makers and practitioners have often tasted disappointment. Annoyance with teachers has grown in the past century. If only teachers were more responsive; if only teachers understood the importance of this or that reform; if only teachers worked harder — so went the refrain. Thus, by asking the wrong question first — How should teachers teach? — a succession of disappointments in classroom reforms led to the inaccurate conclusion that intransigent teachers were to blame. But asking more fundamental questions — Which innovations have been embraced or rejected and why? What are the implications of proposed changes for classrooms and schools? — leads to a very different analysis.

What I am describing is a reframing of the problem. For example, by defining a

problem initially as, say, persuading teachers to install new machines in their classrooms, the solution must be framed in terms of getting *teachers*, individually or in groups, to alter routine behaviors. Such a definition of the problem assumes that convincing teachers to use instructional television or computers or other machines is all that is necessary. Alas, it ignores the power, in shaping behavior in the workplace, of organizational and cultural norms and the individual teacher's perspective.

Similarly, policy-makers who are deeply interested in improving student performance in critical thinking, moral behavior and academic achievement are often unaware of these distinctions about change. They eagerly offer politically feasible solutions to the problems of schools in such simple-minded terms as raising teacher salaries, extending the school day, placing more computers in classrooms, adding steel to the flabby academic spine of the curriculum, introducing more tests for children, publishing test scores or cutting class size. Such solutions are evidence of ignorance about first- and second-order reforms, of a misunderstanding of the power of organizational norms and of a pervasive amnesia about earlier school reforms.

If both policy-makers and practitioners understood the inherent dilemmas of schooling and could distinguish between types of planned change a very different dialogue about the problems that beset the schools would occur. For those who advocate structural (second-order) change in schools, a feeling of impotence might grow. Although my analysis may suggest pessimism about what can be achieved in reforming schools, I believe that viewing change as I have will actually encourage optimism about what can and cannot be done within the current organizational structures. Some reforms will simply not be accommodated by the current system; they will be rejected outright or adapted into pale shadows of their original selves. For those who seek fundamental, second-order changes that will sweep away current structures and start anew, as was done in the mid-nineteenth century, *basic social and political changes would need to occur outside schools.*

There are those, of course, who seek fundamental changes of a less dramatic form. Consider the work of Theodore Sizer's Coalition of Essential Schools or the few isolated experiments in abolishing attendance boundaries within a district, or in setting up teacher-run schools, or in designing and implementing voucher plans. Few proposals, however, have aimed at altering the teacher's role in the classroom or changing the teacher's relationship with the students — except for those few proposals that would saturate schools with fifteen or twenty microcomputers in each classroom. Without a strong push from outside the school, second-order reforms are tough to adopt — and even harder to implement. But they can occur.

Surely, understanding previous school reforms and the distinctions that I made about conceptions of change might lead reformers to hold clearer and more modest notions of what is possible within the current structures of schooling. This argument for modesty should be judged against the unalloyed cheerleading and overpromising that accompany so many proposed reforms. These inflated claims lead inexorably to a wave of disappointment that frequently hardens into an acid rain of cynicism — the most corrosive of fallout from failed reforms. In short, reframing the fundamental questions about school reform is most important. What are the goals of proposed changes? What blocks those goals within and outside the schools? What have previous efforts achieved? Why did they fail? How do organizational structures help or hinder these proposed changes? Answers to such

questions offer more promising agendas both for continuity and for change than does the vocabulary of crisis or the rhetoric of reform.

Notes

1 Mid-nineteenth century reformers, for example, successfully introduced the graded elementary school, which replaced the one- or two-room schoolhouses in towns and cities. The architecture, use of time and governance of elementary schools changed dramatically and has become the norm. Yet reformers also introduced such innovations as the Dalton Plan, the Platoon System, classroom radio, programmed instruction, open classrooms and flexible scheduling. Few traces of these reforms remain. For confirmation of the observation of continuity amid change see John Goodlad, *A Place Called School* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984), Ch. 4; and Larry Cuban *How Teachers Taught* (New York: Longman, 1984), Ch. 6.

2 The concepts *first order* and *second order* come from Paul Watzlawick, John Weakland and Richard Fisch, *Change: Principles of Problem Formation and Problem Resolution* (New York: Norton, 1974).

3 The structure of schools includes the formal and informal goals used to guide funding and organizing activities, including such things as who has authority and responsibility for governing schools and classrooms; how time and space are allotted; how subject matter in the curriculum is determined; how students are assigned to classes; how those classes are organized; how the different roles of teachers, principals and superintendents are defined; and how such formal processes as budgeting, hiring and evaluating are determined and organized. To a large extent these structures shape the roles, responsibilities and relationships within schools.

I want to make sure that my distinction between the two orders of change is clear. I do not value one sort of change more than the other. Recall my earlier points that change is not necessarily improvement and that improvement is largely in the eye of the beholder. I do not question the intentions of those who boost first- or second-order reforms. I question only their understanding of what they are attempting to change.

4 Michael Kirst, 'Teaching Policy and Federal Categorical Programs,' in Lee Schulman and Gary Sykes (eds), *The Handbook of Teaching and Policy* (New York: Longman, 1983), pp. 434–6.

Chapter 5

Education Reform Strategies: Will They Increase Teacher Commitment?*

Susan J. Rosenholtz

Since the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education prophesied doom for public education over two years ago, educational policy-makers in nearly every state have scrambled to predict and conquer educational events and practices that appear to be most out of control. Underlying much of the current flurry of reform activity is the assumption that teachers' lackluster performance in no small way accounts for the inadequacy of student learning.

From the researcher's perspective, the teacher workforce is indeed sorely troubled. Shortages of qualified teachers have already begun to appear in some states (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 1984). The intellectual caliber of new teaching recruits, at least to the extent that it is revealed by measures of verbal ability, is considerably lower than it was a decade ago (Schlechty and Vance, 1983). While teachers with the highest verbal ability stand the greatest chance of succeeding academically with students (Ekstrom, 1975; Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Rosenholtz, 1989), their early defection from the workforce is disproportionately higher than those with low verbal ability (Mark and Anderson, 1985; Schlechty and Vance, 1983).

Because of widespread — and largely justified — alarm about the status of our nation's teaching corps, many states and localities are seeking through various means to improve their teaching forces. These efforts take many forms: written examinations for teachers, extended apprenticeship periods, financial incentives and rewards for classroom excellence, various schemes for evaluating teacher performance and more. Most of the reform efforts have been subjected to little critical analysis and even less evaluation. To make matters worse, interventions are apt to be implemented without the use of currently available knowledge about the teaching occupation — knowledge that strikingly contradicts many approaches to school reform currently under way.

*This chapter was published in *American Journal of Education* (August 1987) 95(4): 534–62, drawing on a paper commissioned by the National Center for Education Statistics. The research was funded by a grant from the National Institute of Education (NIE-G-83-0041). The author acknowledges assistance from Susan Kyle, Paula Silver and two anonymous reviewers who commented on an earlier draft.

In this chapter I argue for the necessity of research and analysis for present education policy-makers, so as to encourage good ideas, discourage bad ones and permit wise mid-course corrections. To illustrate how cumulative research and analysis can provide sound information to foster and support further school improvement, I examine in some detail two education reform efforts that have gained considerable currency among policy-makers nationwide. My purpose is to elucidate ways in which policy intervention may affect teachers' academic success with students, their sense of teaching efficacy and their commitment to the reform. I follow this with a brief discussion of the aims of policy research and specific policy recommendations arising from my analysis.

Education Reform

Max Weber once posed a critical dilemma when he asked how one controls organizational participants to maximize effectiveness and efficiency and minimize the unhappiness this very need to control produces. This same dilemma exists today not only in large-scale organizations but in schools as well. It serves as a meaningful backdrop for thinking about the potential conflicts that confront the current reform movement: those of standardization and autonomy, management by hierarchical control or facilitation of professionalism, mandatory versus voluntary change and so forth.

The view of school improvement advanced here attempts to deal with these conflicts by applying a broad base of knowledge about the organizational conditions necessary to improve teacher quality and commitment to a detailed analysis of how these conflicts are played out in two current reform efforts: minimum competency testing for students and career ladders for teachers.

It makes sense to filter the effects of current reforms through the lenses of teachers involved, since only those factors that are perceived by teachers can affect their subsequent attitudes and behaviors. That is, how teachers experience policy changes will affect their commitment to them and the extent to which these interventions will have salutary effects on student learning. To explore teachers' perceptions, I turn to qualitative data from my ongoing study of the organizational context of teaching (Rosenholtz, 1989) conducted in Tennessee, where a career ladder plan and minimum competency testing were concurrently being implemented. Data collected from extensive interviews with a stratified random sample of seventy-three elementary teachers statewide will illuminate many of the conflicts embedded in these reform efforts. I will also draw on a wide range of studies by others who seek to chronicle the effects of similar reform efforts both in Tennessee and elsewhere in the nation.

Minimum Competency Testing

Of fundamental importance to any policy study of education reform is the definition of student learning itself; and a pivotal part of the current reform movement, at least in the elementary school grades, is the understandable focus on students' basic skill mastery and the means to assure content coverage. Minimum competency testing (MCT) is often

heralded as a viable means to exercise hierarchical control over teachers' curricular choices by establishing clear instructional objectives and systematically examining their attainment through standardized testing (Resnick and Resnick, 1985). Indeed, Dornbusch and Scott (1975), in their oft-cited study of organizational authority, found that evaluation of work was the pivotal mechanism through which control was exercised. Control through evaluation was found most effective when those being evaluated believed the evaluations were important, central to their work and capable of being influenced by their own efforts. Herein lies a fundamental challenge confronting MCT: where teachers perceive it as both soundly based and negotiable, their commitment to the program and their classroom curriculum should be aligned closely.

Task Conceptions as a Potential Source of Conflict

This challenge, however, looms large indeed when we examine teachers' task conceptions — the goals of their work and the technology available to attain them. Quite apart from children's mastery of basic skills, teachers may define student learning as developing students' problem-solving skills; raising youngsters' self-concepts; encouraging friendly interpersonal behavior; instituting peace and quiet in the classroom and corridors and so on. Not surprisingly, teachers seldom use objective test results to gauge their teaching effectiveness (Ashton and Webb, 1986; Lortie, 1975; Kasten, 1984). With MCT, then, teachers and policy-makers may hold highly divergent task conceptions about the very substance of teaching.

Moreover, confronted by the same task demands, constituents may hold entirely different conceptions about the way work should be carried out: policy-makers tend to emphasize task uniformity, whereas teachers stress the need for task diversity; policy-makers tend to emphasize task simplicity and routinization, whereas teachers stress complexity and uncertainty (Scott, 1981).

To complicate the issue further, task conceptions held by different constituencies are associated with preferred work structures (Scott, 1981). Teachers who view their work as uncertain and complex will naturally desire more autonomy and discretion to carry it out; policy-makers who view teachers' work as more routine will prefer hierarchical work arrangements that both centralize decision-making and promulgate directives for teachers to follow. All of this means that, given disparate task conceptions held by teachers and policy-makers, there is a fundamental and profound basis for conflict over MCT. In the section that follows I explore these conflicts as they relate to Tennessee's MCT program. A caveat is in order first to explain the circumstances under which MCT was implemented.

MCT in Tennessee

Two Tennessee task forces, each consisting of approximately five State Department of Education personnel, five education professors and five hand-picked elementary school teachers, initially developed an MCT program for elementary grade students. Although 80 per cent of the teachers came from suburban or urban districts ranked statewide in the top

14 per cent by per-pupil expenditure, over two-thirds of the districts in the state are rural and poor, many ranking among the poorest in the nation (Fowler, 1985).

Using assorted grade-level curriculum guides and basal texts, the task forces identified 708 skills in reading and 661 skills in math and, to measure pupils' mastery of these, constructed 241 reading and 435 math tests. Tests were to be administered individually and orally to kindergarten and first grade students to avoid reading difficulties.

During the first year of mandatory implementation, districts chose to institute either the reading or the math 'Basic Skills Program'. The state assigned districts the task of monitoring teachers' compliance with the program; district reports, in turn, were scrutinized by the state. Compliance was assured, as open systems theorists would quickly point out (e.g., Scott, 1981), because the state ultimately commanded and could thus just as easily redraw the fiscal resources vital to the survival of districts and schools within them. Accordingly, interviews we conducted with teachers at the end of this initial year revealed uniformly high conformity to the standards statewide, as well as accompanying realignments in their instructional emphases.

Unintended Consequences of MCT

Because of conflicting task conceptions and preferred work structures, MCT was not welcomed by the majority of Tennessee teachers, resulting in negative and unintended consequences. In particular, respondents voiced concern that their loss of task autonomy constrained their ability to deliver appropriately paced instruction. Standardized curriculum, teachers explained, impaired their discretion to match appropriate learning objectives to particular student needs (see also Darling-Hammond and Wise, 1985). Over one-third of our sample expressed this objection:

> All kids are to be exposed to all skills. I don't think that does any good. If you progress too fast, the kids still lose out. The kids have to learn the basics first, or it won't do any good to expose them to other skills.
>
> There are too many [math] skills to get through when some children can't even 'regroup.' Because children are different you have to make allowances for them.
>
> With the Basic Skills Program every day I feel more frantic. I feel like a cattle-driver with a whip — like we have to get through the pass before nightfall.

In the implementation of MCT, then, some teachers confronted a dilemma between the *coverage* of basic skills, on the one hand, and rudimentary *mastery* of them, on the other. As it turns out, the problem of inappropriate instructional pacing is the villain of the piece in many teaching and learning problems. Barr (1975), for example, has estimated that over 80 per cent of the variance in reading achievement is accounted for by pacing. Proper pacing means striking the critical balance between students' achievement levels and their successful task experiences, an undertaking that takes on exponential complexity as the heterogeneity of students' achievement levels within a classroom increases (e.g., Beckerman and Good, 1981). This latter point is particularly meaningful for the present

analysis: more than 80 per cent of our sample reported teaching academically heterogeneous classes, and almost all worked with low-SES students in varying proportions (ranging from 4 per cent to 94 per cent). Not unexpectedly, inappropriately paced instruction — directly associated with emphasis on coverage of material — has been found to account for poor reading performance on the part of low-SES students (Dreeben and Gamoran, 1975). The other side of the same coin is that teachers in the most academically successful low-SES schools reject the goal of coverage in favor of more concentrated teaching, scrutiny and selection of appropriate instructional goals and materials, which, in turn, lead to greater basic skill mastery (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986; Levine, Levine and Eubanks, 1985).

A critical question in the study of state-mandated MCT is the extent to which it allows for local variations in students' skill levels and local deviations from statewide standards. State-mandated curriculum that is predicated on assumptions about students performing at grade level will almost certainly fail in more academically diversified classrooms, unwittingly programming students for less (rather than greater) basic skill mastery.

For teachers, the consequences of this problem may be far more extensive than one might initially anticipate. To understand the deleterious affects of MCT on teachers' attitudes and behaviors, we turn to the social psychological literature on workplace commitment. The contributions of Hackman and Oldham (1980) and Gecas and Schwalbe (1983) inform our discussions of the way people's commitment is shaped by varying organizational conditions.

Conditions of Workplace Commitment

Performance efficacy is one of the primary feelings that account for work commitment (Gecas and Schwalbe, 1983). Where people work efficaciously, their feelings are closely tied to how well they perform on the job; good performance is self-rewarding and provides the incentive for continuing to perform well. Alternately, poor performance is an occasion for distress that causes high efficacy people to search for ways to avoid such feelings in the future and to regain those pleasurable feelings that accompany good performance (Hackman and Oldham, 1980).

Several organizational conditions enhance performance efficacy. The first is task discretion and autonomy (Hackman and Oldham, 1980). Jobs that give people autonomy and discretion require that they exercise judgment and choice; in doing so, they become aware of themselves as causal agents in their own performance. Loss of the capacity to control the terms of work or to determine what work is to be done, how the work is to be done or what its aim is to be, widens the gap between the knowledge of one's unique contributions to work and any performance efficacy that can be derived from it.

Accordingly, with the advent of MCT, respondents in our sample took considerable umbrage at the state's confiscation of their professional autonomy: 'For someone else to tell me what they think is needed when I can see some other things that are needed myself is infuriating.' And this: 'What really bothers me is that the teacher's judgment is not considered important any longer. We used to be able to decide things . . . Now we teachers are frustrated.'

This dysfunctional conflict was no better illustrated than in the classroom curriculum resulting from MCT. The need to ensure that their students passed competency tests forced teachers either to equivocate angrily or to de-emphasize reluctantly other important content areas (see also Darling-Hammond and Wise, 1985). Over one-fourth of our sample voiced this complaint: 'I am not able to do things that are good for kindergartners. I feel like I have to hide in my room to let children have show-and-tell.' 'I wanted to do more creative dramatics and storytelling [this year]. I wanted to expand my study of marijuana that I instituted last year. Maybe draw in some teenagers to talk with the class. But there is not a lot of time to do anything like that. I did the drug unit during health but I had to steal time for the dramatics.'

Recall from earlier discussion that task conceptions shape the structural arrangements within which work is performed. Whoever controls that structure, as Scott (1981) points out, can fundamentally alter the task conceptions of people who work within it. The specific point here is that, with MCT, teachers may deflect attention and effort from earlier task conceptions to a narrower or altogether different set of goals embodied in the evaluation system.

In two recent studies of MCT the redefinition of teachers' task conceptions is precisely what occurred. Shannon (1986), in interviewing twenty-four elementary teachers who had been using MCT in reading for at least two years, found a major effect was the routinization of teaching. Increasingly told what to teach, when to teach it and when and how to evaluate, teachers abandoned their own pedagogical judgments about tending to the varied needs of students. When MCT in math was implemented in Pittsburgh's schools, teachers gradually omitted from their teaching those topics *within* the curriculum that would not be tested directly in a given year (Resnick and Resnick, 1985).

Lest readers question the value of alternate learning opportunities, they need only consider the effects of MCT on the language arts curriculum alone. Writing instruction and practice in some classrooms have been replaced by rote exercises in sentence diagramming (Suhor, 1985), an ineffective strategy to help students better their writing skills (Sherwin, 1969), but nonetheless content most likely to appear on competency tests (Suhor, 1985).

Where students' opportunities to master a broader base of knowledge are undermined because teachers must divert their instructional emphases to material that is tested, to material that many consider inappropriate, and to material that they have had no hand in shaping, their performance efficacy and workplace commitment suffer (e.g., Shannon, 1986).

The Absence of 'Buffering'

Performance-based efficacy also depends on organizational conditions that facilitate the attainment of work goals; for teachers, on conditions that optimize student growth. It follows that intrusive managerial tasks that pull teachers away from instruction are frequently culpable in the loss of their workplace commitment (e.g., Blase, 1986).

In Tennessee's MCT program, basic skills were often at odds with those in districts' basal texts; and, because of most districts' fiscal constraints, outside resource materials had to be located and purchased by teachers themselves. Moreover, in many districts teachers

tested both for mastery in their own basal series to meet district requirements and again tested for mastery to meet state requirements.

Given all this, it is not surprising that the most onerous aspect of MCT to three-quarters of the teachers in our sample was the time needed to acquire materials to teach state-mandated skills, the overwhelming burden of additional paperwork and the time required to test, all of which they perceived as needless encroachments on their teaching. On each of these points there was nearly unanimous accord: 'Each student has to take twenty or thirty tests. It seems to be that "Basic Skills" is more testing than teaching. That is all I do.' 'I am actually teaching less.' 'It takes away from actual time spent working with children.' 'There's not much teacher time to be human toward the students.' Teachers chronicled precisely how they accommodated to these new extraneous demands by reducing their instructional time with students: 'I really feel bad because I'll let the kids have five extra minutes of play or give them independent seatwork so I can get some of my work done. I feel bad about taking time away from my students, but I have to.' 'I feel like I'm robbing Peter to pay Paul. The time has to come out of somewhere, doesn't it? I can't not sleep each night because I have to do paperwork for the state. So I have to take it out of my teaching time.'

Rather than providing students with greater opportunity to master basic skills and testing them to ensure mastery, MCT instead robbed them of access to their most critical learning resource — teachers' instructional time. Overburdening paperwork reduced both student-teacher interaction and student learning — the stuff of performance efficacy.

The Negative Consequences of Low Commitment

The absence of conditions that allow people to feel efficacious in their work has profound and negative consequences for their commitment to it (Gecas and Schwalbe, 1983). Subordinates recognize the real constraints and deprivations on their performance and have a clear sense of their low efficacy. But because people usually have the need to make self-enhancing judgments about themselves, the definition of success in these settings is often recast among subordinates in terms of behaviors and values that still allow them opportunity to derive a sense of self-esteem, status and control. Instead of fulfillment through work, subordinates redefine their goals as simply to 'make out'. 'Making out' behaviors — providing temporary relief from boredom, finding ways to leave the job, focusing more on social than on work relationships with co-workers and so forth — are, of course, antithetical to organizational efficiency. Stated differently, work becomes devalued and at the same time oriented toward satisfactions other than those that come from successful job performance (Gecas and Schwalbe, 1983).

In a like manner teachers who lack opportunities to attain work-related goals, who feel professionally disempowered and unefficacious become disaffected, absent themselves from work or defect from the profession (see Rosenholtz, 1985, for a review). As a mediating step along the way, low-efficacy teachers converse more with their colleagues about poor working conditions than about teaching problems and their solutions (Ashton and Webb, 1986; Rosenholtz, 1985, 1989). This pernicious type of talk presents something of a paradox for teachers. Where they regularly complain about difficult

working conditions — such as insufficient resources with which to teach and a lack of understanding by the state in respect to the teaching realities that they confront — they buttress their belief that any lack of teaching success is attributable primarily to external causes over which they have little control. Indeed, when we asked teachers what they generally talked about with their colleagues, many replied unhesitantly, 'State skills. Well, you know the record keeping is now about as ridiculous as it can get. The whole system is supposed to help us become more efficient, but what good is it if it takes half the day to figure it out? There aren't many teachers here that would disagree with that.' 'The basic skills program. Also the career ladder. Those have been the main topics this year. They just keep putting more and more requirements on us and teachers' general attitude toward them is very negative.'

Because colleagues convince each other that confronted by such overwhelming odds, no one can reasonably expect to succeed, teachers more readily give up (Ashton and Webb, 1986; Rosenholtz, 1989). It is not unexpected that 20 per cent of our respondents either openly contemplated leaving the profession or reported others doing so, directly because of MCT. 'I have enjoyed teaching but I am planning to retire early because I have been frustrated in my ability to do what I know is best in my own classroom. I think that with the amount of paperwork that we have, the recording and testing and everything, that I'll leave that to someone younger.' 'I am really afraid all the good teachers are going out of teaching. Sometimes I ask myself, "Will we only have desk-sitters in the future?" '

Further, over 60 per cent of our sample complained of lower faculty morale brought about by MCT:

> I think the morale of teachers is very low now. The teaching load as far as book work, paperwork, is just weighing them down so heavily that they resent spending their time with paperwork and not actually teaching. If we had aides to help us, then we could spend more time teaching. Teachers just realize that there are not enough hours in the day, so many of us will bring stacks of work home, and I work almost every night until eight or nine o'clock, sometimes midnight, and that gets old after a while. You have to enjoy what you're doing, and I do enjoy being with children, if I just had more time to teach them instead of filling out reports.
>
> In the past I've always enjoyed teaching. I felt that I helped in some way. Now there is so much other than teaching I am required to do. I guess I am just burned out. I am not looking forward to the fall.

That reduced teacher commitment may result from policy changes is a noteworthy labyrinth of education reform that begs research disentanglement. If policy changes pose too great a burden, teachers may dissociate themselves from their work and receive social support from colleagues for the divestiture. The possibility that increased demands that serve as barriers to classroom effectiveness may cause good teachers to defect must also be entertained and examined. In sum, researchers who chart policy changes need to be mindful of this fundamental paradox: the administration of MCT may place new demands that create additional problems — lowered teacher commitment — that worsen the very instructional services reformers intended to improve. Problems that arise from the implementation of new policy are, of course, not intractable. But without research activity

to assess the effects of policy changes on the teacher workforce and without proper procedures that feed back essential information and recommendations to policy-makers, it is not likely that corrective action will be undertaken.

Benefits of MCT

Slightly more than one-fifth of our respondents did embrace and derive benefit from MCT (see also Darling-Hammond and Wise, 1985). Most came from settings closely resembling those of the original developers of the Basic Skills Program — suburban districts with comparatively greater fiscal resources, far less heterogeneity in students' social class and academic backgrounds, and greater emphasis on basic skill mastery. Three points arise from this. First and foremost, teachers' task conceptions were more closely aligned with the goals of MCT, reducing the potential for conflict. Second, that the large majority of these teachers enjoyed relatively less academic diversity in their classrooms with more students performing at grade level guaranteed a better fit between MCT and youngsters' learning needs. Third, almost all teachers reported sufficient buffering with which to implement MCT: because of greater fiscal resources, districts and schools within them acquired additional and vital teaching materials; paid aides or parent volunteers handled new paperwork and testing demands; and district office personnel calibrated state and district requirements to avoid duplicative testing. Because of these factors, MCT posed fewer threats to teachers' task autonomy and discretion. As teachers succeeded in meeting minimum competency standards, they accrued greater performance efficacy from their work. Under precisely these conditions, as Dornbusch and Scott would readily agree, evaluation of work — as a device for organizational control — well satisfied subordinates.

Among the teachers we interviewed 22 per cent found the standards and tests helpful in detecting students' learning difficulties and, of far greater significance, in modifying the way learning was perceived by both students and teachers. As one explained, 'I find skills that children don't have and so I have to teach them. Now teachers care that students learn. Before they could just teach and, if the students learned, okay; if not, they could just go on to the next thing. The kids also know that "I have to know this" and "my teachers care that I get it." So it helps.'

Others stressed the meliorative effects of MCT on poorer teachers, for example, 'I think the standards are more effective for teachers who need guidelines.' In fact, some teachers hailed the change as a way to orient their *own* classroom instruction, thereby ensuring that the most important skills received adequate time and attention: 'I think it helps a teacher measure her own teaching. Lots of times I will compare my tests [the district's] with theirs [the state's]. Now I'm more aware of some specific skills and how well I have taught them as well as how well they're covered in the curriculum.'

Some additional factors in the study of MCT, at least at the elementary school level, include the extent to which standards gradually alter teachers' task conceptions, what they come to emphasize in their classroom curricula, and how they subsequently gauge their effectiveness. That is, where standards for student mastery are clearly specified and where teachers are judged ultimately by their students' success in reaching these standards, instructional content may become driven by newly implemented standards and their

measurement. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this may already be occurring in Texas, Detroit, South Carolina and Maryland (Popham *et al.*, 1985).

But any such investigation depends on the contextual conditions in which teachers are embedded. A goodly portion of the differences between those who applauded the Basic Skills Program and those who disdained it may be explained by the fit between teachers' task conceptions and MCT and the resources at their disposal to execute the reform, including the distribution of raw materials — students themselves. In other words, both the nature of the problems that teachers confront and the nature of the strategies that are conceived to remedy those problems are shaped by the circumstances under which they occur.

To briefly review, then, MCT embittered most teachers because of hierarchical decision-making about teaching problems and solutions over which they exercised no control, because of insufficient resources to implement the reform, and because teachers, rather than collaborating about how problems created by MCT could be solved, filled the void caused by the above conditions with counterproductive communications.

In the next example of education reform — career ladders — we shall confront some of these same issues. Specifically illustrated are the consequences of decentralized decision-making versus the state's hierarchical control for teachers' workplace commitment.

Career Ladders

Interpreted most generously, career ladder plans (CLPs) intend to bring about a salutary effect on schools through functional assignments in which talented teachers take on additional school-system responsibilities — in return for increased pay and status — to help their colleagues improve. To examine the potential of these assignments and to illustrate how research knowledge can be usefully brought to bear on policy decisions, I contrast two examples of CLPs currently under implementation. The cases illustrate rather dramatically that the success of reforms in helping teachers become more efficacious and contribute more productively to schools depends in large measure on how carefully they are designed and implemented.

In the first example Hart (1985) instructively details one Utah district's attempt to institute a CLP from twenty-seven interviews she conducted with principals, teachers and the superintendent. Here the CLP was developed by a task force of administrators and teachers from each of the district's schools, headed by the superintendent. Explicit in the plan was a commitment to the *individual school* as the most promising organizational level for improvement and change, and the desire to marshal the resources of experienced and talented teachers within it to bring such improvement about. Ideas were negotiated with faculties through task force representatives; at the time of its implementation, 80 per cent of the district's teachers voted in its favor.

The career ladder consisted of four steps. The two highest levels — teacher specialist and teacher leader — carried with them salary increments of $900 plus pay for additional contract days to work on instructional improvement projects, clinical supervision, mentoring and assisting probationary teachers with professional development. Individual faculties selected teacher leaders and specialists on the basis of instructional collegial

leadership. Each school defined teacher specialist roles, their number allocated by school size with an eye toward serving specific faculty needs (e.g., the number of probationary teachers needing assistance and supervision, specific program needs, faculty expertise, etc.). Empowered by their expertise, teacher leaders shared (albeit in sometimes intimidating ways) decision-making responsibilities with building principals.

Several benefits reportedly accrued to schools during the CLP's first year:

1 During the extended contract days, planned opportunities for teacher collaboration were organized, which resulted in increased faculty interaction and group cohesiveness.
2 Teacher leaders provided in-service programs based on topics identified by individual school faculties.
3 Probationary and experienced teachers began to request technical assistance *on their own initiative* from teacher leaders, who also reported benefiting a great deal from these interactions.
4 Teachers at *all* levels received reinforcement for the quality of their work. Teachers gained more knowledge of their colleagues' skills and talents.
5 Principals and faculties confronted and communicated with each other on professional issues; faculty meetings evolved into substantive decision-making arenas.

Several structural features implicit in the plan accounted at least in part for its initial success. First, teachers' being given considerable task autonomy and discretion both to formulate and to implement the CLP better ensured their commitment to it. As a result, teachers' task conceptions were closely aligned with program goals. That is, because teachers collectively constructed the plan it came to have shared meaning and value. Second — and this requires a brief caveat — in-service needs were defined by teachers themselves: the agenda evolved from problems to be solved or goals to be accomplished at specific schools. To understand why this particular feature may have engendered greater commitment to the CLP, we again consult the literature on the organizational conditions under which people experience high performance efficacy.

Teachers' Learning Opportunities

If job commitment is to be enhanced, work must provide challenges and opportunities to deal successfully with them. Opportunities that allow people to grow and develop, to perfect current skills and learn new ones, give them a sense of challenge, progress and personal accomplishment that increases the meaningfulness of work and their commitment to it (Hackman and Oldham, 1980).

For their part teachers often complain of monotony, professional stagnation and a lack of direction, where they have continued to use the same instructional techniques and practices year after year, quite often to the point of becoming bored, unenthusiastic and unable to motivate students (Blase, 1986; Kasten, 1984). We can then understand more fully why the absence of opportunities for professional growth is a common explanation teachers offer for their absenteeism and defection from work (Kasten, 1984; Rosenholtz, 1985, 1989).

Most schools provide only limited opportunity for teacher learning. For one thing, the average in-service teacher receives fewer than three days of 'staff development' each year, and little of that training deals with instructional problem-solving (Joyce, Bush and McKibbin, 1981). For another, the most common types of in-service training are one-time 'pullout' programs designed by district office administrators that have little, if any, immediate or sustained effect on teachers' instructional improvement (Little, 1984; Walberg and Genova, 1982).

In the CLP studied by Hart, learning opportunities were intentionally decentralized: teachers not only specified goals according to their own learning needs, they also designed school in-service programs to help meet these needs. This means that personalized rather than standardized help was available. Assistance was therefore useful enough for teachers to avail themselves of opportunities for professional growth and challenge. Because the district granted individual faculties the autonomy and discretion to shape their own learning opportunities, teachers were more likely to implement new techniques, strategies and ideas, thereby enlarging their instructional repertoires.

A third possible explanation for the CLP's success — one that requires more substantial exposition on the latter theme — is that criteria for advancement on the district's career ladder included instructionally related collegial leadership. That this element was viewed as central to the plan's success represents a marked departure from the experience teachers typically confront in schools. Working in professional isolation, where they seldom see or hear each other teach, teachers rarely communicate about task-related matters — especially by requesting or offering professional advice and assistance in efforts to improve instructionally (see Rosenholtz, 1985, for a review).

Professional isolation occurs, at least in part, because, as teachers act to protect their self-esteem, they shy away from situations where conclusions about a lack of professional adequacy may either be publicly or privately drawn. If the call for aid raises some questions about how capably they can render such assistance, if they might be found wanting or deficient, rather than sustain possibly negative evaluations, they will frequently and unconsciously forgo helpful efforts on behalf of a colleague. Likewise, teachers avoid requests for assistance, where they are viewed as potentially embarrassing or stigmatizing and where they threaten to disclose professional inadequacies.

However, to the extent that teachers believe that anyone, even the most capable colleague, might need help in a similar situation, it becomes unnecessary for them to draw causal inferences about their own teaching adequacy. That is, if teaching is collectively viewed as an inherently difficult undertaking, it is both necessary and legitimate to seek and to offer professional assistance. This is exactly what happens in the most instructionally successful schools. Here, because of strong administrative or faculty leadership, teaching is normatively defined as a collective rather than an individual enterprise, and requests for and offers of assistance among colleagues set the conditions under which teachers improve instructionally (Rosenholtz, 1985, 1989). Thus the criterion of instructional leadership in the CLP studied by Hart explicitly underscored the importance of teachers' collaborative exchange. Mindful of the importance of teachers' learning opportunities for their commitment, we can understand why the CLP produced greater exchange of advice and assistance among colleagues.

There is a fourth possible reason for the success of this Utah plan. Integrating leaders'

interactions with colleagues into regular workday activities heightens teachers' consciousness of learning as a continuous process. Nowhere in Hart's data is this more poignantly illustrated than in experienced teachers' requests for advice and assistance from teacher specialists and leaders. For these teachers particularly, a repository of new ideas, techniques and models, like a centripetal force, pulled them toward a mission of professional improvement essential to their commitment to the CLP.

That teacher learning is experienced as a collective, recurrent aspect of school life seems equally important for new entrants to the school; beginners offered help; beginners who see requests and offers of assistance continuously exchanged among colleagues become socialized to the ways in which one learns to teach. That is, norms of collaboration establish themselves in situations where newcomers observe colleagues engaged in some mutually accepted definition of the way teaching is done. Hart found that in implementing the CLP, novices more readily solicited and accepted advice and assistance. But, where beginners observe few instances of teacher collaboration, they learn that teaching is more an individual than a collective endeavor. Because requests for advice and assistance in isolated settings are intepreted more as signs of teaching inadequacy than as eagerness to learn, in times of trouble novices seldom ask.

Finally, the initial success of this Utah district's CLP may also result from the benefits teacher leaders accrued as they supported the work of others. In helping their colleagues improve, teacher leaders were apt to confront new work challenges and feelings of greater efficacy. Indeed, there is ample evidence that providing teachers with the opportunity to assume responsibilities, initiative and authority commensurate with their talents and abilities, and recognizing them for a job well done, increase their workplace commitment (see Rosenholtz, 1985, for a review).

Unintended Consequences of CLPs

We also find unintended and pernicious consequences in the forging of CLPs, and, among their many variations, there is grist for the policy researcher, that, when combined with the proper feedback mechanism, results ideally in guidance for the reform itself. Next I identify some of the problems states and localities confront in their efforts to implement CLPs.

Evaluation Standards

States and districts can and are identifying evaluation criteria that, because they are based on the teaching effectiveness literature, may differentiate effective from ineffective teachers, at least in basic skill instruction for low-SES youngsters. The challenge to devise means that distinguish competent from great teachers, however, has yet to be met successfully. If exceptional teaching remains more a reputational than an observable phenomenon, the implications for changing good teachers into great teachers are few. Of equal importance, if teachers do not accept evaluation procedures as a legitimate gauge of their classroom effectiveness, there is precious little basis for organizational control without subordinate alienation (Dornbusch and Scott, 1975).

The Tennessee teachers we interviewed were confronting the state-developed evaluation and selection procedures for career ladder advancement for the first time. The CLP contained four steps with supplemental salaries of $2000–$3000 for advancement to the two highest career levels, plus additional pay for extended contract duties. Developed over an eight-month period, the CLP, like its MCT counterpart, permitted teachers no meaningful involvement. Primarily for this reason, the NEA affiliate, representing some 80 per cent of the state's teachers, actively but unsuccessfully campaigned against passage of career ladder legislation (Handler and Carlson, 1985).

A newly created Board of Education — appointed by the governor — was charged to oversee and monitor CLP implementation. A specific criterion for appointment to the board was that members hold no prior association with the education profession. After five months of study, the board's chairperson testified in legislative session that policy-making for the CLP was 'not based on proper information, not based on knowledge, not based on experience, but *absolutely* based on recommendations by the State Department of Education'. He further testified that he and other board members understood neither what they were doing nor the ramifications of their decisions. 'One of the things we have not done enough is listen to teachers', he confessed (Morgan, 1985).

Because decision-making in the Tennessee CLP was so deliberately centralized, explicitly excluding teachers from either formulating or overseeing its implementation, nearly two-thirds of the sample we interviewed challenged the fairness and legitimacy of the evaluation system. Over half of our respondents, for example, charged that the classroom observation procedures better measured teachers' cunning and endurance than their effectiveness — for example, 'You can do anything for a few days if you know an evaluator is coming in.' 'The evaluators only make three observations, two of which are prearranged with the teachers. You can fool anybody for a couple of days.'

Confirmatory support for these qualitative data comes from two concurrently conducted studies of Tennessee teachers. In Handler and Carlson's (1985) survey of over 1000 randomly selected teachers statewide, only 34 per cent believed that the state's method of classroom observation was appropriate, purposeful, useful or objective. In Morgan's (1985) survey of 178 teachers statewide, only 5 per cent deemed the evaluation procedure satisfactory, and 82 per cent of the respondents — among them those who had already been promoted to one of the two highest career levels — felt that a significant number of mediocre teachers could reach these levels by deceiving evaluators. Teachers expressed identical sentiments in Handler's (1986) study. In interpreting these findings, it is well worth noting that a clear majority of respondents in both studies felt that teaching effectiveness *could*, with proper time, expertise and effort, be evaluated with reasonable accuracy. Teachers' complaints instead focused on the inadequacy of the specific evaluation system developed. In Morgan's survey, for example, 97 per cent of the respondents felt that the CLP had not been adequately analyzed and prepared before it was implemented.

Of equal relevance, the clear majority of teachers in Handler's (1986) study, as well as our own respondents, voiced the complaint that the observation system was *not* designed to help them improve instructionally. Specifically, state evaluators gave little or no feedback (helpful or otherwise) to applicants who were observed, for example, 'Teachers want to see their evaluations; I think all of us have a right to see the evaluations done on us.' 'If an evaluator really talked with them [teachers] after each evaluation, and just

explained, instead of [teachers] having to wait until right before school starts [to discover the outcomes], it would be fairer.' If evaluation practices offer few learning opportunities, that is, means by which teachers can either identify improvement needs or redirect their energies toward betterment, we can clearly anticipate a decline in teacher commitment to the CLP. One teacher's comment underscored this point rather poignantly: 'My morale is low this year because I went through the career ladder [evaluation]. It was pretty rough. I had to be evaluated by three people from the state department. My principal had to evaluate me also. She was very positive and made suggestions and I agreed with them. When the people from the state came in they used a form that had a little tiny space for strength and a big space for weaknesses. It was very ego-deflating.'

The applicant for the two highest career levels — level II and level III — was required to submit a 'portfolio'; an astonishing array of materials from five previous teaching years including sample lesson plans, behavioral objectives, test items, disciplinary standards and teacher-made materials, which the state weighted more heavily than actual classroom observations (Morgan, 1985). According to teachers in our sample, these could be fabricated without the dimmest glimmer of relevance to one's actual classroom performance: 'You have to write lesson plans, unit plans, and document everything with letters. People can really make this stuff up if they want to. I know people who are doing that. The main thing is that it doesn't show whether you're a good teacher or not.' 'A person who is a good test-taker and does well assembling materials could be a rotten teacher. They could fool anybody.'

Worse still from the perspective of teachers' commitment to the CLP, and parallel to Tennessee's Basic Skills Program, was teachers' pervasive complaint that the construction of the portfolio robbed students (as well as family members) of applicants' time and attention:

> The hours needed to develop a good portfolio do not reflect a good teacher, so I decided to drop out. I also think that all those hours take away from the children. The teachers don't go in fresh. Only one teacher in our school stayed in.
>
> A good friend of mine applied for career level three. She gave her whole year to three. Not only did it take away time from her classroom; it took away from her six-year-old daughter, who finally one night *begged* her mother to just take the time to talk with her, because she spent every waking minute on that *stupid* portfolio, and all that junk that they wanted in there. She had to choose one or the other.

In Morgan's (1985) survey, 96 per cent of the respondents — including those who had been promoted — felt that the portfolio required too much time and paperwork to be worthwhile. In Handler and Carlson's (1985) study, 78 per cent of the teachers indicated that the portfolio was a waste of time and an inappropriate measure of teaching effectiveness. Teachers further reported that the time-consuming nature of the evaluation procedure was one reason that many had chosen not to apply. We found this latter comment conspicuously stressed in our own sample as well. Teachers cited either themselves or their best-performing colleagues as choosing to devote their year to students rather than to developing a portfolio:

> My principal really encouraged me to apply. He said that I could do it, and that I was already doing this and already doing that. And I did sign up for it. And then they started making changes and adding this and adding that, and you had to go take this test over, or go take this test in addition to that test . . . that was taking away from my time, and I just felt that I really needed the time to work on things to help my children and things for my classroom. So I dropped out.
>
> The time I spend on my job will be spent on preparing classes not on a portfolio, or running down the hall asking people to sign papers that I have had a student teacher or a field trip. I use my time and energy *on my job*.

Distributive Justice

Quite apart from the organization's inability to exercise control, additional deleterious consequences result from centralized decision-making about evaluation standards and teachers' subsequent unwillingness to accept their legitimacy. Simply put, if career promotions are based on faulty evaluation practices — and if the best teachers are not selected for promotion — teachers' sense of injustice will stir. If the procedures by which the distribution of rewards are perceived as unjust or unfair — that is, if the contributions of rewarded teachers are perceived as no greater than those of the unrewarded — problems of distributive justice arise. Unrewarded individuals react to injustice by attempting to restore equity in the setting. Typically, they may alter the level of their own contributions downward in the direction of lower commitment, or they may leave the situation altogether (Cook and Hegtvedt, 1983).

In our study, teachers' persistent challenge to the soundness of evaluation practices caused many to forebode trouble when rewarded teachers began to make substantially higher salaries than others. Typical of their comments: 'I really don't feel like the teachers who applied [to the CLP] are doing a better job. There's going to be a lot of conflict.' And this: 'Neither of the two teachers who've applied for the top career levels are the best teachers in this school. If they make it, the rest of us will resent it terribly.'

These teachers' apprehensions were confirmed through interviews conducted just after career ladder selections had been officially published in newspapers throughout the state. Each respondent expressed grave reservation, surprise and dismay about many of those chosen to advance: for example, 'I know someone who just got to career ladder two and she's one of the poorest teachers I know. I like her as a person, but she's a lousy teacher.'

We also encountered evidence of distributive justice:

> I think the career ladder has affected the morale of teachers. It used to be your morale was based on whether you felt you were a success. You could be the best teacher possible. Some teachers that are not nearly as good as other teachers have advanced or succeeded passing a certain stage and it's *obvious* that they are not as good a teacher as someone who did not, and that just shows it's not working. And it's going to make that teacher feel like 'Why should I give all I have anymore? What's the use? Maybe I should go and practice doing what it takes to pass the tests and not worry about what goes on in my classroom.'

> The career ladder has taken morale lower than I have ever seen it. I know that I do my best. I've always tried to do my best and when they tell me that I'm not one of the best teachers because I'm not on career ladder three, that can take your morale way down. I've seen a lot of teachers taking leaves of absence, retiring, and putting less energy into their classrooms.

In Morgan's (1985) survey, 97 per cent of the respondents, including those selected for career advancement, felt that the CLP was ineffective and unfair given the specific teachers who were promoted during the first round. Three-quarters of the teachers reported that the CLP had caused friction among colleagues. Of equal relevance, almost 90 per cent reported that their morale had been negatively affected by the CLP, and 60 per cent reported substantial declines in their commitment to the profession. Similar problems — including collective faculty ostracism of promoted teachers — were reported by Handler (1986).

Problems of distributive justice are significant not only because they reduce the professional commitment of the unrewarded; they also inhibit school improvement if colleagues consider master teachers' advice, assistance or suggestions illegitimate. That is, if teachers come to resent those who are promoted, school improvement becomes an activity restricted solely to the chosen few. How teacher selection for career ladders alters faculty interaction carries profound consequences for the ethos of the school and for the learning and subsequent commitment of teachers who work within it.

Evaluation and Collaboration

Another serious and consistent forewarning by roughly a third of the teachers in our sample about the evaluation instruments employed by the state was their threat to the positive collaborative relations teachers currently enjoyed. Teachers predicted an end to offers of assistance among colleagues because all portfolio material submitted by applicants for evaluation to the CLP had to be accompanied by documentation of its originality:

> I'm not in favor of the master teacher plan. It's too much dog-eat-dog. I don't like the bit of someone getting an idea and wanting to close their door and not share anything with others. It hurts the children. When you do something good, you really ought to say, 'Hey, this really works well — you ought to try it.' Teachers are not going to do that if they have to document everything they've done as original. It's really hard because if you do something really well, you sure don't want anyone else to take credit for it. That's not the way education should be. That is not for the good of the children.
>
> Teachers share a lot here. They are very professional. But the career ladder is changing all that. It used to be that we all had the same goals, so we helped each other. Now that recognition is being directed to individuals, everybody is trying to be their best to help themselves, not others.

If the means to select teachers for career ladder advancement are ill-designed, if they are not thoroughly informed by an understanding of the nature of organizational behavior, they are apt not to succeed. Should the costs of career ladders turn out to be the collegial relations needed to enhance teachers' learning, their performance efficacy and ultimately,

their commitment, in them we have the makings of a national educational failure at the very point in our history when we need a major success.

The evolution of changes among teaching colleagues, therefore, becomes critical to document. Under what conditions will collaborative exchange among teachers be affected by CLPs? What additional training will be needed to help master teachers succeed in their varied functional assignments? What are the best mechanisms for providing such training? What are the characteristics of functional assignments that appear most promising in bringing about school improvement? How can competent teachers who are not selected for advancement still be made to feel appreciated? What will ultimately happen to their school commitment? In raising these and other issues throughout this analysis, I have made implicit assumptions about the nature of policy research that now become essential to explicate. Accordingly, the section that follows discusses the purpose of such research, followed by specific policy recommendations.

Policy Analysis

The Goals of Policy Analysis

At its core policy research is 'decision-oriented' research that aims to provide information to shape policy decisions. As Coleman (1972) defines it, the ultimate product is not necessarily a contribution to existing knowledge in the scholarly sense but rather a social policy modified by the research results. It is necessarily the case, then, that policy analysts focus on evaluating the effects of varying practices or programs alternative to the status quo to (1) understand the respects in which they differ from each other and from the status quo, (2) articulate the consequences of each in terms of costs and benefits, and (3) attempt to meet concrete demands 'as imaginatively as is compatible with meeting them appropriately' (Braybrooke and Lindblom, 1970, p. 99). It is equally the case that analysts must incrementally and serially accumulate knowledge to aid in policy decisions, rather than relying on a single case study (Coleman, 1972; Braybrooke and Lindblom, 1970).

Because the aim of policy research is to develop concrete recommendations that stress tractable variables, much of its current worth hinges on the fact that it will provide a means of assessing the teaching occupation during a time of important changes, of monitoring those changes as they occur and of supplying essential information, analysis and advice to those who will make them occur. Because it provides policy-makers, beneficiaries and the general public with some notion of the actual effect of education policy, findings can be used to modify current programs and help in designing others for the future. Mindful of these benefits, I turn next to specific policy recommendations.

Policy Implications

MCT

Given that public schooling by its very nature serves the interests of society, when policy-

makers perceive that fundamental reading and computational skills have not been taught, skills on which the society depends most earnestly for its survival, it is reasonable that they take measures to ensure that basic skill mastery receives appropriate curricular emphasis. It could hardly be otherwise. But where education policy hierarchically prescribes a standardized curriculum, and where it tightens surveillance to assure compliance, as we have seen, it unwittingly secures the academic progress of but a few and almost certainly condemns the rest. In other words, compliance with MCT does not ensure that teachers will respond rationally or willingly to the program. To the contrary, this strategy often produces consequences that are more inimical than the problem policy-makers initially set out to conquer and control.

There is a viable alternative to hierarchical decision-making and its pernicious and unintended consequences. If the goal of MCT is to improve, support and ensure the capacity of schools to deliver appropriately paced instruction, states must rely on *delegated* authority, precisely because schools confront such complex and uncertain work. Galbraith (1973) describes this arrangement as 'targeting' or 'goal setting', meaning that control, rather than being secured by minute descriptions of tasks and their procedures, is specified by desired outcomes appropriate for the organization. That is, the work of teachers takes place with a structure of guidelines that they help shape, and they are granted considerable discretion over pedagogical decisions concerning means and techniques. Considerable research suggests that teacher involvement in decision-making of precisely this sort is essential to successful educational change (for a review, see Purkey and Smith, 1985).

But for delegated authority to lead to task-related progress instead of organizational chaos, Galbraith argues, two structural mechanisms must be set in place. The first he calls 'augmented hierarchies', where teaching efforts are coordinated by adding specialized administrative and clerical personnel charged with enabling instructional endeavors and gathering and summarizing information needed for future decision-making about students' learning needs and how best to fulfill them. The second Galbraith labels 'lateral connections', where colleagues work in groups to coordinate and share technical information, to save them from floundering and to assist in error correction.

The larger points to recognize are that strategies to implement MCT must maximize teachers' control of the instructional process, while administrators find participatory ways to mobilize teachers' efforts in addressing basic skills problems, and then must provide appropriate resources that respond directly to those problems.

CLPs

The same problems and solutions inhere in career ladder implementation. States and localities may in earnest seek to reward the most outstanding teachers and, through their selections, augment school resources to help more needy teachers improve. But centralized decision-making about how this should be accomplished leads to outcomes that both jeopardize the success of the reform and dampen the spirits of even the most enthusiastic teachers. Delegated authority, by contrast, where district administrators galvanize local staff participation in the design and implementation of CLPs to meet specific teacher learning needs within their respective schools, yields a higher probability that CLPs will result in instructional improvement.

The Role of the State

In three ways state education agencies (SEAs) assume a critical role in delegating authority for the implementation of reform efforts. First, they must specify broad parameters for the development of programmatic goals and permissible variations for local adaptation. Second, they must monitor local implementation efforts and provide helpful feedback directed at improvement. Third, SEAs must set up 'augmented hierarchies' by allocating sufficient resources — both fiscal support and appropriate technical assistance — organized around programmatic goals. Resources include not only teaching materials but also information on model programs for dissemination, replication or adaptation, release time for local staff to observe exemplary practices, personnel who steer local staff toward useful resources and specialists who furnish information and training (Turnbull, 1985). On this latter point Turnbull (1985), in reviewing research on SEAs' efforts to improve school quality, notes that most contain some sort of intermediate unit between themselves and districts for resource allocation, a structure particularly well suited for states such as Tennessee with many small and isolated rural districts. Successful intermediate units, in addition to delivering direct technical assistance to schools, establish networks for information sharing and coordination between districts.

The Role of the District

Successful implementation of new programs, Turnbull also points out, requires that districts clarify at the onset the locus for school change — that is, what they want to accomplish in specific schools — convey this sense of direction, help schools set programmatic goals and monitor goal attainment. Moreover, in utilizing the resources states offer, the most successful implementation efforts provide someone designated as the 'local facilitator' — a member of the district staff who both organizes and advocates the improvement effort in much the same way that intermediate units deliver assistance. That is, local facilitators mobilize the commitment of teachers and administrators, arrange learning opportunities for school personnel, acquire materials, handle schedules and procedural details for implementation, evaluate changes in schools and plan for ongoing change. In fact, local facilitators, working closely with intermediate units, usually produce more positive and enduring change than either working alone (Turnbull, 1985).

Conclusion

The next decade will be a time of enormous turmoil in the teaching occupation. A majority of our teaching workforce in 1992 will be people who are not currently employed (NCES, 1984). This means that well over a million new teachers will be entering the classroom during the next six years. Who they are, how they will be trained and selected, what kinds of experiences and abilities they will bring with them and what kinds of conditions they will encounter in schools are questions of more than academic interest. For this huge turnover is beginning just as the issue of the unsatisfactory quality of American schooling has seized the interest of policy-makers at all levels, policy-makers who intend to

make changes to improve that quality. The major object of these changes is the teaching workforce itself.

The combination of demographic forces and conscious policy decisions makes for a period of extraordinary volatility within and around the teaching force. There is also the eager anticipation — and hope — that, through the many permutations of policy interventions, we will ultimately improve the current performance of schools. In reality, however, not enough information about teachers and teaching is utilized to provide a steadfast base from which policy changes can be confidently launched. Where purposive efforts to improve quality are mounted, they may hit with highly uneven impact if their effects are not properly anticipated. Further, without a satisfactory feedback mechanism, there is no avenue to supply continuing insight, constructive criticism and dispassionate scrutiny to assist policy-makers in knowing whether their efforts are well designed interventions that solve actual problems or merely cosmetic changes that never penetrate the surface.

The task of buttressing policy changes with real information, accurate analysis and sound recommendations falls on the research community. Such an ambitious enterprise has many dimensions: tracing and monitoring reform decisions; providing thoughtful and informed comment about them; offering technical advice to those who will be designing, implementing and evaluating them; and keeping in the public eye the conditions in education generally, and the teaching occupation particularly, that create a compelling rationale for well conceived changes. Only then can the promise of current policy intervention become more than just another episodic chapter in the history of American education.

References

ASHTON, P. T and WEBB, R.B. (1986) *Making a Difference: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Student Achievement*. New York: Longman.

BARR, R.C. (1975) 'The Effect of Instruction on Pupil Reading Strategies,' *Reading Research Quarterly*, 10: 317–27.

BECKERMAN, T.M. and GOOD, T.L. (1981) 'The Classroom Ratio of High- and Low-aptitude Students and Its Effects on Achievement,' *American Educational Research Journal*, 18: 317–27.

BLASE, J.L. (1986) 'A Qualitative Analysis of Teacher Stress: Consequences for Performance,' *American Educational Research Journal*, 23: 13–40.

BRAYBROOKE, D., and LINDBLOM, C.E. (1970) *Strategy of Decision: Policy and Evaluation as a Social Process*. New York: Free Press.

COLEMAN, J.S. (1972) *Policy Research in the Social Sciences*, Morristown, N.J.: General Learning.

COOK, K.S. and HEGVEDT, K.A. (1983) 'Distributive Justice, Equity, and Equality,' *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9: 217–41.

DARLING-HAMMOND, L. and WISE, A. (1985) 'Beyond Standardization: State Standards and School Improvement,' *Elementary School Journal*, 85: 315–35.

DORNBUSCH, S.M. and SCOTT, W.R. (1975) *Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

DREEBEN, R. and GAMORAN, A. (1975) 'Race, Instruction and Learning.' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

EKSTROM, R. B. (1975) *The Relationship of Teacher Aptitudes to Teacher Behavior. Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study: Phase 2*. Final report, Vol 6. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

FOWLER, F. C. (1985) 'Why Reforms Go Awry,' *Education Week* (6 November) p. 24.

GALBRAITH, J. (1973) *Designing Complex Organizations*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

GECAS, V. and SCHWALBE, M. L. (1983) 'Beyond the Looking-Glass Self: Social Structure and Efffiacy-based Self-esteem,' *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 46: 77–88.

GIBSON, S. and DEMBO, M. H. (1984) 'Teacher Efffiacy: A Construct Validation,' *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76: 569–82.

HACKMAN, J. R. and OLDHAM, G. R. (1980) *Work Redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

HALLINGER, P. and MURPHY, J. (1986) 'The Social Context of Effective Schools,' *American Journal of Education*, 94: 328–55.

HANDLER, J. R. (1986) 'Shaping Tennessee's Career Ladder.' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

HANDLER, J. R. and CARLSON, D. L. (1985) *Shaping Tennessee's Career Ladder Program — 1985*. Report to the Secretary of Education, US Department of Education. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee.

HART, A. (1985) *Case Study Prepared for the Utah State Offfie of Education*. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah.

JOYCE, B., BUSH, R., and MCKIBBIN, M. (1981) *Information and Opinion from the California Staff Development Study: The Compact Report*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

KASTEN, K. L. (1984) 'The Efffiacy of Institutionally Dispensed Rewards in Elementary School Teaching,' *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 17: 1–13.

LEVINE, D. U., LEVINE, D. F. and EUBANKS, E. E. (1985) 'Successful Implementation of Instruction in Inner-city Schools,' *Journal of Negro Education*, 54: 313–31.

LITTLE, J. W. (1984) 'Seductive Images and Organizational Realities in Professional Development,' *Teachers College Record*, 86: 84–102.

LORTIE, D. (1975) *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

MARK, J. H. and ANDERSON, B. D. (1985) 'Teacher Survival Rates in St. Louis, 1969–1982,' *American Educational Research Journal*, 22: 413–21.

MORGAN, B. (1985) 'Career Ladder Plan Not Working, Survey of Teachers Indicates,' *Chattanooga Times* (15 August) p. 35.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS (1984). *The Condition of Education*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education.

POPHAM, I. J., CRUSE, K. L., RANKIN, S. C., SANDIFER, P. D. and WILLIAMS, P. L. (1985) 'Measurement Driven Instruction: It's on the Road,' *Phi Delta Kappan*, 66: 628–34.

PURKEY, S. C. and SMITH, M. S. (1985) 'School Reform: The District Policy Implications of the Effective Schools Literature,' *Elementary School Journal*, 85: 353–90.

RESNICK, D. P. and RESNICK, L. B. (1985) 'Standards, Curriculum, and Performance: A Historical and Comparative Perspective,' *Educational Researcher*, 14: 5–20.

ROSENHOLTZ, S. J. (1985) 'Effective Schools: Interpreting the Evidence,' *American Journal of Education*, 93: 352–88.

ROSENHOLTZ, S. J. (1989) *Teachers' Workplace: A Social Organization of Schools*. New York: Longman.

SCHLECHTY, P. C. and VANCE, V. S. (1983) 'Recruitment, Selection, and Retention: The Shape of the Teaching Force,' *Elementary School Journal*, 83: 469–87.

SCOTT, W. R. (1981) *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

SHANNON, P. (1986) 'Merit Pay and Minimum Competency Testing,' *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21: 20–35.

SHERWIN, J. (1969) *Four Problems in Teaching English: A Critique of Research*. Scranton, PA: International Texbooks.

SUHOR, C. (1985) 'Objective Tests and Writing Samples: How Do They Affect Instruction in Composition?' *Phi Delta Kappan* 66: 635–9.

TURNBULL, B.J. (1985) 'Using Governance and Support Systems to Advance School Improvement,' *Elementary School Journal*, 85: 337–52.

WALBERG, H.J. and GENOVA, W.J. (1982) 'Staff, School, and Workshop Influences on Knowledge Use in Educational Improvement Efforts,' *Journal of Educational Research*, 76: 69–80.

Chapter 6

Teaching Incentives: Constraint and Variety

Gary Sykes

Two perspectives dominate the literature on incentives in teaching. The first seeks truth on average and for the most part, the modal tendencies that characterize teaching, the grand patterns, the systemic features of the occupation. The second perspective identifies discrepancies and anomalies, the variation around the mean, the exemplary, outlying case. The first perspective raises few hopes that substantial change is possible. The concept of 'incentives' suggests variables that can be easily manipulated to produce changes in behavior. 'Sticks and carrots' is the familiar phrase. Both policy-makers and organizational theorists are used to thinking in terms of altering incentives to produce changes. But considerable research and commentary in teaching suggest that the incentive structure of teaching poses formidable constraints on the prospects for reform. Fundamental aspects of teaching, this perspective holds, are essentially unalterable, and these aspects compose and deeply influence incentives in teaching. The second perspective provides a more hopeful approach to the possibilities for change. If there are modal tendencies in teaching, so too is there variation. Some communities, some districts, some schools and some teachers stand out and exemplify good practice. The task is to distinguish good from mediocre practice, to abstract principles from the success stories and to spread good works. Although there may be constraints, this perspective capitalizes on variety for promising leads and the hope of steady, incremental improvement.

To provide a balanced assessment of teaching incentives, acquaintance with both perspectives is necessary. An understanding of the constraints protects against facile solutions and false optimism. By itself, however, this perspective leads into a cul-de-sac of fatalism. An understanding of the possibilities suggested by variety points to ways out, grounds hope in concrete instances of good practice and of pitfalls to avoid. Constraint and variety, then, form the analytic themes of this essay, the twin speakers through which to drive insights about teaching incentives.

Preliminary Distinctions

The terms 'reward' and 'incentive' often are used interchangeably in common parlance, but within the analytic literature take on more specific meaning. Generally, reward

conveys a broad meaning, denoting the pleasure, satisfaction or fulfillment gained from an activity or experience. Incentive is conceived as a reward offered or exchanged for specific work behavior. An incentive is an *anticipated* reward that directs the action of a worker. Incentives, then, are often conceived as methods or tools with which social groups or organizations induce specific behaviors.

This distinction does not quite do away with ambiguity. Is incentive a sub-category of reward, or, rather, an attribute of a reward, so that under some circumstances any reward could become an incentive (Mitchell *et al.*, 1982)? The latter conception seems more promising analytically as it avoids the untenable view that some rewards can never serve as behavioral incentives. But so defining this relationship opens up a wealth of complexity. To determine the conditions under which a reward has incentive value requires an understanding of (1) what individuals anticipate will be rewarding; and (2) the mechanisms that control the distribution of those rewards. The incentive system available to any worker, then, will depend on the motivations he brings to the worksetting, and on organizational mechanisms to control reward distribution.

This observation suggests, following Chester Barnard's (1938) classic formulation, that organizations may improve the incentive value of their reward system by altering the worker's 'state of mind', and/or capacity of the organization to offer rewards already perceived as worthwhile. However, work motivation, a 'state of mind' construct, is a complex matter. Incentives operate not through some simple connection between action and reward, but on subjective perceptions regarding cost and reward values. Much of the research on human motivation is experimental and relatively low on ecological validity, and there are multiple theories of human motivation (see, e.g., Weiner, 1972). In real-world action settings, identifying the play of human motives is exceedingly difficult.

Assumptions about human motivation are necessary to explanations of work behavior, but teaching work takes place primarily within organizations and social groups that influence individual behavior through structure and culture. To understand the effects of various incentives on teachers requires knowledge and assumptions about individual psychological processes, about social and organizational arrangements and about their interaction.

Incentives influence participation and performance in organizations. Katz and Kahn (1978), for example, classify behavior necessary to organizational functioning as (1) joining and staying in the system (recruitment, absenteeism and turnover); (2) dependable behavior/role performance (meeting or exceeding quantitative and qualitative standards of performance); and (3) innovative and spontaneous behavior/role performance beyond role requirements (creativity, professional growth, problem-solving, cooperation, etc.). These distinctions suggest the targets at which to direct incentives. From a policy perspective, the equity implications of incentive systems are also important, the effects incentives have on access and opportunity in education. A fundamental principle of equity is that each school should receive its fair share of good teachers, a policy goal far from realization. Combination of these distinctions yields the following targets for incentives in teaching:

The *composition* of the teacher workforce, as shaped by recruitment and retention;

The *distribution* of the teacher workforce across states, districts and schools. Teachers are the most critical resource for learning in school, and so must be fairly distributed;

The *disposition* of the teacher workforce with respect to such process factors as performance and effectiveness, commitment and professional growth, efficacy and expectations, innovative and problem-solving behavior and others.

The *effects* of teachers in terms of student learning and other outcomes of schooling.

In the discussion to follow reference will be made to each of these policy goals.

The Constraint Perspective: Some Realities of Teaching

Education's Market Structure

Incentives to attract and motivate teachers, suggests much commentary, are both weak and scarce. Consider first an analysis at the sector level. Education is a public monopoly:

> . . . it is not market oriented; it is widely considered to be socially necessary and therefore deserving of public protection — is, in fact, the captive servant of a captive clientele; it is open to a good deal of public scrutiny on issues having to do with perceived equity, quality, and goals; it cannot unambiguously define its aims or clearly identify technologies that are dominant in light of aims that might be specified; its contribution to its clientele's life and learning is uncertain and also modest as compared to other societal influences; its governance is highly decentralized, yet subject to a wide variety of influences so that each unit perceives itself as facing a unique configuration of clients and masters. (Pincus, 1974, p. 115)

One might quarrel with one or another of these observations, but education's market situation is self-evident. A healthy dose of capitalist competition, argue Milton Friedman and like-minded economists, is the most obvious, direct and powerful means to reshape the incentive structure of teaching. Absent choices, the education system's clients — parents, students, community members — cannot exert much influence on a large, cumbersome public bureaucracy. How to motivate teachers to adopt promising new practices, to be responsive to students, to have high expectations for learning and to display similar desirable behavior? Introduce choice via open enrollment plans, vouchers or tuition tax credits, answer market-oriented economists.

Proponents of choice schemes argue that local bureaucratic centralization is only one of a large number of ways to organize public education. There are alternatives on both the supply and demand sides. Clients can be given choices and providers could be freed to supply local options at the school or district levels (Elmore, 1986). Unrestrained individual choice is not likely to yield collective, public welfare, but with some restrictions, choice systems could dramatically alter teaching's incentive structure.

This is not the place to debate these schemes. The point is that one powerful source of motivation in many organizations — the opportunity for clients to switch brands, parties, services — is largely absent in education. In a monopoly situation consumers cannot 'exit'; their only recourse is to complain, and to seek changes (Hirschman, 1970). Perceptions of decline in educational quality can produce political action of various kinds, but schools

have developed capacities to resist change while appearing to be responsive. Without competing alternatives, argue some analysts, the prospects for improvement are weak because the spur of competition is missing.

Teaching and Transcendent Ideals

Man searches for meaning in his work, for significance that enobles and commits. Private schools attract individuals with deep commitments to particular religious ideals and traditions despite lower salaries and fewer resources than most public schools provide. Teachers in inner-city parochial schools express a sense of mission that knits them together into a community of believers (Cusick, 1985). The same is true for teachers in Christian academies (Peshkin, 1986) and élite New England private schools (Lightfoot, 1983, Chs 5, 6). A community of belief, often set against prevailing cultural beliefs in the larger society, can supply esprit and commitment to transcendent ideals that are powerfully motivating.

The political ideology of the public schools, however, precludes such particularistic commitments. The strict separation of church and state in our society means that publicly supported schools must be secular in their orientation in order to serve children of diverse creeds and origins. But secular societies fail to supply connection to the transcendent ideals and purposes provided by religious institutions. Parochial schools typically offer lower wages than public schools but attract teachers who wish to live out their religious commitments in communities of like-minded believers.

Canada offers a setting in which to study these motives because in three of the five western provinces public funds are used to support the parochial schools; in the other two the catholic schools are private. Some research indicates higher levels of affiliation and commitment among teachers and parents associated with the privately funded schools.[1] These schools tend to be at risk financially and to demand sacrifices to keep them alive. Consequently, members of the school community feel specially needed; they contribute to the survival of the school.

Public bureaucracies are restricted in the dedication they can command from their employees. Public school teachers may live out a service ideal, but the institution they work within tends to be large, impersonal and secular, features that over time sap commitment. By contrast, private schools are mostly small, personal and value-laden institutions, whose clients must volunteer to join. Often they are beleaguered financially and must struggle to attract students and to survive. Their special missions compel intense loyalty from those who choose to affiliate, for they are sacrificing much for their beliefs. Public schools lack the circumstances to command similar levels of dedication from unionized employees working in large bureaucracies.

Incentives and the Occupational Ethos of Teaching

A third set of constraints on the employment of incentives rises out of the ethos of the profession, '. . . the pattern of orientations and sentiments which is peculiar to teachers and which distinguishes them from members of other occupations' (Lortie, 1975, p. viii). Dan

Lortie has provided the most comprehensive recent analysis and his portrait stresses the relative weakness of rewards and incentives in teaching.

Lortie distinguished extrinsic, intrinsic and ancillary rewards of teaching. The first include rewards attached to the role that exist independently of role incumbents, including salary and benefits, level of prestige, power over others. The second refer to sources of satisfaction rising out of the work itself. These are largely subjective and will vary over time and from individual to individual. The third refer to objective characteristics of work that may be perceived as rewarding by some, but not necessarily all, teachers. An example might be a work schedule that permits easy integration of family duties with work responsibilities, a factor likely to be of greater importance to women. His major observations, largely supported by other accounts of teaching, are as follows.

> Psychic rewards assume the greatest importance for teachers, particularly rewards derived from interaction with students. Individuals are drawn to teaching out of a desire to work with people and to live out an ideal of service. Teachers feel most rewarded when they 'reach' students, have a good day, make a lasting impression on youngsters and produce learning in their students.
>
> Teachers downplay extrinsic rewards in their self-reports. The ethos of the profession supports altruistic motives and provides little warrant for concern about wealth, status or power. However, there are indications that many teachers today may be unhappy with these features of the occupation, a point taken up below.
>
> Lortie's data indicate a disjunction between engagement and work satisfaction, especially for young men and older single women. The return on time and effort devoted to teaching does not appear to warrant the investment, producing patterns of disengagement by many career teachers who may turn to other interests, or psychologically withdraw from the work.
>
> The satisfactions of teaching are not easy to come by. Lortie portrays teachers as uncertain and anxious about whether they are having effects on students. The uncertainties are endemic: teachers must work with conscripts in groups and must elicit work from them. Criteria for effectiveness are vague, expectations are multiple, often conflicting and global. Easy entry to teaching and the unstaged nature of the career fail to provide structural reassurance about competence.
>
> The task imperatives of teaching — what is necessary to carry out the work — are ill-supported by teacher status realities. Teachers must manage groups and create an environment for learning, often a delicate accomplishment. Yet they control neither the conditions nor the resources of work. Teachers, Lortie notes (pp. 165–6), are like theater directors and middle managers without comparable control or resources.
>
> The teaching career has few rewards associated with it. Salaries are front-loaded; individuals will reach peak earnings by their late 30s, then plateau thereafter. Few advanced positions exist to fulfill ambitions, provide variety and challenge or stimulate growth. Furthermore, teaching has been institutionalized as temporary work, with easy entry, exit and re-entry. Career rewards depreciate collegiality and the emergence of leadership among teachers: few consider teaching suitable work for a lifetime, and veterans possess ambiguous status at best; they are 'survivors' in a dubious system.

> The organization within which teachers work has few selective incentives to distribute. Schools tend to be 'incentive-poor': there are at best only modest informal means for rewarding teachers — choice assignments and schedules, in-service experiences, some extra pay for extra duties.
>
> Career and work incentives contribute to the norms of privacy and individualism. Teachers protect autonomy in the classroom at the expense of colleagueship and professional community. Isolation, and its debilitating effects, is perhaps the most widely noted social feature of teaching. Teachers become 'entrepreneurs of psychic profits' (Lortie's phrase) striving to secure rewards from their own students while resisting organizational demands that divert them from this quest.

This portrait of a profession seems dispiriting enough, but a recent update of Lortie's work etches the lines yet more deeply. In 1984 a research team revisited Dade County, Florida, where Lortie had collected survey data in 1964 for his study. They administered the same survey to a large sample of teachers, then compared their results to Lortie's (Kottkamp *et al.*, 1986). They found a substantial increase in the number of teachers reporting no satisfaction from extrinsic rewards, a decrease in the numbers reporting satisfaction from their status in the community, and an increase in the importance of ancillary rewards, particularly the opportunity to have time away from teaching (vacations, summers). The authors concluded that teachers find their work less rewarding today than teachers did twenty years ago. The features of teaching receiving greater emphasis today are the opportunities to get away from the work, not to succeed at it. Reviewing these results, Lortie (1986) posits increased 'structural strain' in teaching: '. . . tension between the qualifications and self-images of teachers in large school districts, their position in the formal system of governance, and their ability to make firm decisions in matters related to their own classroom and students' (p. 571).

An implication of this occupational analysis is that the accommodations made over the decades to teaching's weak rewards have themselves become sturdy features of the occupation that are highly resistant to change. Job security in exchange for better pay and status may be a tolerable bargain for many, a bargain that accountability efforts threaten. Task interdependence and collegiality may be low, but teachers have learned to guard their constrained autonomy behind the classroom door. The absence of career advancement may drive the ambitious out of teaching after a few years, but those who like the opportunity to enter, exit and re-enter easily may not hunger for advanced responsibilities. So, although surveys routinely turn up evidence of teacher dissatisfaction, many proposals to alter fundamental aspects of teaching such as career ladders, merit pay, peer evaluation, team teaching and others meet with resistance. Many teachers have adapted to the constraints in place; on balance the effort necessary to make big changes may not appear worthwhile.

Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services

Public service organizations, argues Michael Lipsky (1980), confront a common set of pressures that shape the orientations and work routines of the 'street-level bureaucrats' who must provide services to large numbers of people. His analysis, like Lortie's, locates

difficulties in motivating and directing the work of teachers in fundamental aspects of the work situation. A selective review of his generalizations will illustrate this point of view:

> In human services, chronic resource shortages are the rule, not the exception. This may reflect public spending priorities, but the underlying cause is the infinitely elastic nature of demand for services. The schools in our century have become multi-purpose human service agencies, expected to meet a wide and expanding range of needs and problems. Teachers are expected to meet the needs of individual students yet confront them in groups of twenty-five to thirty. 'The fundamental service dilemma', notes Lipsky, '. . . is how to provide individual responses or treatment on a mass basis' (p. 44). Even modest reductions in class size strain school budgets as well as society's capacity to produce enough teachers. Sarason (1982) refers to the 'myth' of class size reduction in noting that if tomorrow Congress passed a bill appropriating funds to reduce all classes to twenty or fewer students, society could not produce enough teachers to meet the demand. Furthermore, the human demands on teachers are enormous and would continue to be so even if they faced classes of twenty rather than thirty. Teachers must husband their resources and ration services, yet these necessary responses to the work situation run counter to the ideology of individual needs. This tension between ideals and realities is inherent in the situation and deeply influences teachers' capacity to obtain rewards from the work of teaching.
>
> Teachers, like other street-level bureaucrats, pursue conflicting and ambiguous goals, many of which cannot be easily measured. Goals such as good health, equal justice and public education are 'more like receding horizons than fixed targets', and the front-line individuals charged with their pursuit often have little control over all the factors affecting the outcome. The relationship between means and ends is often unclear, provoking a restless search for what works, and the existence of multiple goals often leaves conflicts of purpose which the teacher must resolve (see, for example, Berlak and Berlak, 1981, and Lampert, 1985, for accounts of specific dilemmas and how teachers manage them). Without a delimited set of goals with corresponding performance indicators and output measures, it is extremely difficult to control the work of teaching through incentives. Efforts to 'manage by results' often divert teaching from what is desirable to what is measurable, thereby distorting the broader, deeper and more humane purposes of the enterprise.
>
> Working in schools as in other human service agencies involves a basic contradiction: 'On the one hand, service is delivered by people to people, invoking a model of human interaction, caring, and responsibility. On the other hand, service is delivered through a bureaucracy, invoking a model of detachment and equal treatment under conditions of resource limitations and constraints, making care and responsibility conditional' (Lipsky, p. 71). Teachers are caught between often conflicting demands to serve as advocates for their students, and to meet responsibilities as subordinate employees in a hierarchical organization. The result often is goal displacement — process students rather than educate them; control behavior rather than impart knowledge. Yet the psychic costs, the alienation created by this loss of ideals, take a toll on the inner life, corrode the spirit of the individual who loves children, who came to serve, who seeks to hold onto a positive image of self. Horace's compromise

(Sizer, 1984) is but one example of a pervasive pattern in human service work. 'The existential problem . . . is that with any single client [teachers] could interact flexibly and responsively. But if they did this with too many clients their capacity to respond flexibly would disappear' (p. 99). So teachers must trade quality of service for serving more students, a trade no matter how made that must create doubt and anxiety.

Functions of Weak Incentives

One perspective on this situation is that teaching's weak rewards and incentives did not develop through accident or inattention. The difficulties in attracting, holding, nourishing and directing a sizeable corps of teachers are deeply rooted in structural constraints — a public monopoly organized along bureaucratic lines; in historical accommodations to the rapid growth of the educational system; in the occupational ethos of teachers; in the indeterminacy of means and ends in education and the lack of a firm knowledge base; and in the existential realities faced by teachers in their daily work situations.

Weak incentives are so persistent and pervasive a feature of teaching as to raise a question: do weak incentives serve any functions in teaching? This appears a peculiar question. The usual move is to regard weak incentives as the problem, then search for solutions — higher pay, career ladders, improved working conditions and so on. But, this question insinuates, might weak incentives *be* the solution to certain endemic problems in teaching? If so, this helps explain the persistence of weak incentives for they simultaneously represent the conditions of teaching *and* adaptations to those conditions.

To understand the potential functions of weak incentives, a closer look into the psychological operation of incentives is necessary. The most familiar image of the impact of rewards on behavior is operant conditioning theory, wherein rewards are conceived as stimuli evoking responses. Within this framework goals serve to direct behavior: individuals choose a goal then organize their actions to reach it. Humans are prospectively rational, this theory proposes. Other theorists, however, posit more complex cognitive mediation between external incentives and responses. Within this view people act first, then determine the goals of their actions later. 'The rationalizations developed for particular behavior can affect subsequent behavior by their focusing and committing effects' (Pfeffer, 1982, p. 105). People are retrospectively rational according to these theories, and construct beliefs and attitudes out of reflection about their actions (Weick, 1979).

Incentives enter the picture because they have a double significance: 'The informational aspect facilitates an internal perceived locus of causality and perceived competence, thus enhancing intrinsic motivation. The controlling aspect facilitates an external perceived locus of causality, thus undermining intrinsic motivation and promoting extrinsic compliance or defiance' (Deci and Ryan, 1985, p. 64). The incentive structure of human action supplies information leading to attributions that influence subsequent behavior and attitudes.

The implications of self-perception or retrospective rationality arguments have been developed in two distinct but conceptually related literatures. One treats the consequences of engaging in some activity for an insufficient reward (Bem, 1972); the other deals with

the consequence of overrewarding behavior (Deci and Ryan, 1985; Lepper and Greene, 1978). The fundamental generalizations emerging from these two lines of research are the following (Pfeffer, 1982):

> . . . persons who are induced to engage in some behavior for little or no external reward will adjust their attitudes to be more favorable toward the intrinsic aspects of the task they are doing. This attitudinal change results from a process of rationalizing why they are engaged in the action. In the absence of external reward, they rely on internal constructs of positive affect and self-motivation to explain their activity (p. 107).

And,

> . . . if paying people too little or providing too few external reasons for their behavior increases their task interest and job satisfaction, providing too many rewards or paying them too much undermines task interest and job satisfaction. The argument is that persons confronted with salient extrinsic reasons for their activity will attribute their behavior to these external factors and, therefore, have less reason to justify their actions as being the result of the intrinsic nature of the task or situation itself (p.109).

A large body of experimental research has explored both hypotheses, but there has been relatively little work in field settings. Nevertheless the implications for the role of weak incentives in teaching are suggestive. Two speculations occur (the reader might supply others):

> Weak external incentives support the service ideal in teaching, focusing teachers on relations with students as the primary source of gratification. Given the nature of teaching work, with a premium placed on nurturing, caring behavior, this incentive structure is functional. Performance contracting or other forms of pay for results might well dehumanize teaching work by directing teachers to the pursuit of external rewards at the expense of developing caring relations with students.
>
> Commentators note the tendency for teachers to lower expectations about student achievement, to make 'deals', 'treaties', and 'bargains' with students that exchange behavioral compliance for easy standards and superficial engagement in the hard work of learning (see, for example, Sedlak *et al.*, 1986, Powell, Farrar and Cohen, 1985; Cusick, 1983). Weak incentives may serve as a psychological resource in this process, helping to rationalize the gradual loss of ideals while holding onto some self-esteem. Coupled to the extreme difficulty of engaging most students most of the time in real learning, weak incentives encourage teachers to adjust perceptions of what they can accomplish to the realities of teaching. Weak incentives convey the message that only so much is expected of teachers. Losing initial ideals from one perspective is adapting to the demands of work from another. Weak incentives help to justify such adaptations. 'How can we be expected to accomplish so much if the rewards are so few?' might be the message to self that forms over time, serving as a protective, coping mechanism for teachers.

Other functions of weak incentives rise out of organizational rather than cognitive *concerns:*

> Weak incentives help promote turnover. Turnover is functional in two respects. First, human service work is so emotionally demanding that few people can sustain it year after year without encountering burnout or other stress reactions. The absence of strong career rewards means that many individuals will be short-termers, or will leave for a period then re-enter, or will enter late. If teaching featured a strong career line that required sustained experience for upward mobility, the psychic toll would be great. High turnover allows regular infusions of fresh recruits, a necessity in work of this sort. Second, high turnover helps reduce educational expenditures. School systems regularly replace senior with junior teachers, saving increments on the pay scale. If all entering teachers remained a full forty years, the cost implications would be significant, and a graying workforce would be less responsive to innovation than an age-mixed workforce. Consequently, weak career incentives serve a number of functions.
>
> Weak incentives form part of the recruitment bargain of teaching. As Parsons (1958) noted, incomes of persons working in the public sector are lower but more secure than those earned in the private sector. Individuals attracted to public sector occupations accept the trade-off between the amount of money received and the amount of risk entailed. The occupation is populated with persons who have accepted this bargain. Consequently, incumbents are unlikely to feel enthusiastic about schemes that increase income in exchange for greater risk. In this case it is not the weak incentive per se that is functional but its correlate, security.
>
> Teaching sanctions diverse interests. Weak incentives allow low commitment which in turn frees teachers to engage in a range of other activities, including second jobs (Geer, 1966). In 1981, for example, an NEA teacher survey (1982) reported that 19.8 per cent of teachers were employed outside the school system in the summer, 11.1 per cent during the school year. Many individuals in our society may want to blend several lines of work rather than submitting to the demands of a single occupation. Teachers own small businesses, sell real estate, tend bar, run summer camps. These secondary jobs provide income, diversity in work and connections in the community. Teaching's weak incentives tacitly sanction such combinations. Teaching may attract individuals who wish to avoid narrow, intense work commitments in favor of occupational diversity, or encourage adaptation in this direction among those who decide late to stay on. In either case such individuals are likely to resist calls for greater commitment to teaching because they have struck a different bargain, one predicated on low commitment. Of course, teaching does not preclude single-minded dedication, and many make this choice; but neither does teaching demand it.
>
> Schools, according to prevailing popular metaphor, are loosely coupled organizations (Weick, 1976). Control and coordination of work are weak despite the outward trappings of bureaucracy. In organizations featuring poorly understood technology, little evaluation of work and weak market mechanisms, formal structure and processes are not coupled to work performance, and this is useful: it permits the work

> to be done according to the localized judgments of those doing the work, while presenting to the outside world the appearance of rational control (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). If teachers are in the best position to interpret and respond to the needs of students, then the fact that teachers are beyond the reach of organizational controls may benefit students because control mechanisms, including those that are incentive-based, reduce and otherwise distort the scope of caring and responsiveness. Teachers, as both Lortie and Lipsky argue, must manage a set of ambiguous, conflicting purposes, none of which can be ignored entirely. Strong external controls tend to be reductionist and to oversimplify the complexities of teaching work. Teaching's weak incentive structure leaves teachers unsupported but provides considerable room for creative subversion of bureaucratic rules and regulations, at least some of which get in the way of good teaching.

These arguments are highly speculative. They serve to illustrate, not to exhaust, the possibility that teaching's weak incentives may over time have come to serve adaptive functions, perhaps even to have engendered commitments among teachers. Weak incentives have emerged as a common definition of the problem in teaching; this has led to a variety of policies designed to improve the rewards of teaching. This concern has overshadowed the possibility that weak incentives serve a series of adaptive functions and are complexly interrelated with other features of teaching. 'Adaptive' and 'functional' do not equal 'desirable', of course. Some of the adaptations are pathological in terms of student well-being and the longer-term interests of teachers. With others it is not so clear. However, this perspective argues that changing fundamental features of teaching, even those that appear pathological, may be considerably more difficult than the reform rhetoric would lead one to believe. Furthermore, the uses of weak incentives are but one aspect of the broader theme that fundamental constraints rooted in the nature of teaching work, in the development of the occupation and in the sentiments of teachers restrict the possibilities for directing teaching work through manipulation of incentives. To understand the possibilities for progress, we must turn to the second broad perspective.

Variety as Possibility: The Search for Exemplars

If teaching on average features weak incentives, there is also considerable variation in the educational system. How rewarding teaching is depends on characteristics of teachers, including their gender, race, age, social background and other factors, and on the situations within which they teach. Much current literature identifies school-level characteristics that influence the satisfactions of teaching, and more recently intrerest has also emerged in district-level factors.

A review of evidence from this perspective can be divided according to a widely recognized distinction in response to the question, 'What do people want from their jobs?' Responses tend to break into two sets of factors: those related to satisfaction, happiness and fulfillment; and those related to dissatisfaction and unhappiness. The first have to do with the work itself — tasks, events indicating success in performance, possibilities for professional growth. The second have to do with the conditions that

surround the job, including physical working setting, interpersonal relations, salary, job security, policies and regulations, etc. When this second set of factors falls below acceptable levels, job dissatisfaction ensues, However, the reverse is not true. Optimal external conditions will not by themselves produce positive attitudes. Human need for challenge, self-actualization and competence stems from the experience of work itself and the intrinsic rewards associated with that work. But the foundation or fulfillment of such needs is associated with surrounding factors such as fair compensation, working conditions, administrative practices, etc. Herzberg *et al.*, (1959) label these factors 'hygiene' and 'motivation', to distinguish basic health needs from the higher needs for self-realization and growth.

Establishing the Foundation: Attracting and Retaining Teachers

The simplest, most direct policy variable to manipulate in attracting teachers is salary. Research indicates teacher supply is responsive to salary differentials and a number of generalizations are evident:

> Despite school finance reform efforts in many states there are still substantial interdistrict disparities in educational expenditures. Odden (1986) cites a number of studies indicating large differences by district in overall per pupil expenditures, class sizes, teacher-administrator ratios, percentage of teachers with a master's degree, teacher salary, books-and-materials expenditures per pupil and other measures. To interpret such discrepancies fully requires an accounting of variations in cost across districts, but even after such adjustments inequities are likely. Local capacity and preference to support education will exert a strong influence on a district's ability to attract and retain teaching talent. State equalization measures are in place in many states but inequities are still large.
>
> Some evidence (Turner *et al.*, 1986) indicates that salary incentive to attract teachers with master's degrees has modest effects on student achievement. However, a district's ability to provide such incentives is a function of (1) median family income and (2) economies of scale based on district size. Large districts can achieve economies by increasing pupils per teacher, then use the savings for salary incentives. Small rural districts do not have this option.
>
> Recent reviews of compensation in teaching (Ferris and Winkler, 1986; Stern, 1986) indicate that aggregate teacher supply is positively related to salary levels in teaching and negatively related to salary levels in alternative occupations. The most comprehensive study, conducted on a sample of teachers in Britain (Zabalza, 1979), found that a 10 per cent increase in relative salary would bring about a 21 per cent increase in female entrants and a 36 per cent increase in male entrants to teaching.
>
> The amount of income individuals must forgo in order to teach varies by field. One study (Levin, 1985), for example, reports that in 1981–82 undergraduates majoring in humanities or the social sciences had to give up $1100-$1300 of income in selecting teaching over positions in business and industry. Chemistry and computer science majors, however, had to forgo $8500, and physics majors $10,600. Shortages in fields

such as math and science extend back decades and obviously are related to such wage differentials.

Higher salaries also are likely to produce higher SAT scores among recruits. One study (Manski, 1985) found that setting a minimum SAT score (verbal plus math) at 1000 would require raising teachers' salaries approximately $90 per week (in 1979 dollars), if the fraction of high school graduates who eventually enter teaching were to be held constant. SAT scores are not a proxy for teacher quality, but academic ability is at least a desideratum in teaching.

Wage differentials affect teacher mobility between districts. Higher wages decrease the probabililty that teachers will leave (Eberts and Stone, 1984), other factors being equal.

Wage differentials contribute to teachers' decisions to leave teaching. Teachers are influenced by what they are making relative to what they can make in other fields; the wider the perceived difference, the greater the likelihood teachers will exit for other work (*ibid*).

Racially isolated inner-city schools have particular difficulty attracting and holding teachers due to a range of non-monetary factors related to working conditions. Efforts to offset poor working conditions with monetary incentives have been only marginally successful. 'Combat pay' tends to attract young, inexperienced teachers from nearby schools, only marginally improves turnover and does little for instructional quality (Bruno, 1986).

Economists argue that teacher salaries are 'hedonic wages' that reflect characteristics of individuals and jobs (Rosen, 1974). That is, teachers respond to a mix of salary, working conditions and other job characteristics. Teachers may be willing to trade salary for other benefits such as small class sizes, motivated students and pleasant surroundings. Unfortunately, these factors often seem to cluster. Some districts offer higher wages and better working conditions, others offer neither. There is little firm evidence based on teacher behavior to indicate how teachers make trades among these pecuniary and non-pecuniary factors, but survey and interview data reveal sources of teacher dissatisfaction that vary across districts and schools:

In a recent national survey (Metropolitan Life, 1985) a substantial percentage of teachers reported as less than adequate such resources as: administrative support (18 per cent); people responsible for discipline (25 per cent); guidance counsellors (38 per cent); and teachers's aides (43 per cent). Not surprisingly, the percentages of teachers reporting unsatisfactory conditions are highly associated with the wealth of the school district within the state.

A survey of California teachers (Koppich, Gerritz and Guthrie, 1985) found that: 27 per cent of teachers say they have insufficient textbooks and other instructional materials; 10 per cent report having too few desks and chairs for students; 20 per cent say they do not have access to audiovisual equipment; and class size reductions headed the write-in responses (see also McLaughlin *et al.*, 1986), an understandable complaint in that California has the largest teacher-pupil ratio in the country.

A survey of New Jersey teachers (Eagleton Institute, 1986) produced results somewhat different from those in California. These teachers were most dissatisfied with the amount of paperwork, administrative duties and time spent on non-teaching responsibilities. They also objected to low salaries and to their lack of voice in school policy-making.

Two other teacher surveys emphasize the large discrepancies that exist between teachers' desired versus their actual involvement in school decision-making. The 1986 Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher revealed that 97 per cent of teachers surveyed agreed that school districts should have a team approach to school management involving teachers, but only 50 per cent of teachers reported this as the reality (p. 50). Another recent survey found that large numbers of teachers report little involvement in such matters as hiring staff, establishing testing or grading policies, setting expenditure priorities, developing a student discipline code, selecting texts, planning staff development or evaluating teaching.[2] Teachers vary in their desire to have greater authority over such matters, but in many schools teachers apparently have little opportunity to exercise control over some central aspects of teaching.

These salary and working condition factors influence recruitment, retention, mobility and job satisfaction in teaching, but act only as the foundation on which to build organizations that support teacher growth, competence and commitment. Subtle factors involving both the hard Ss — strategy, structures, systems — and the soft Ss — style, skill, superordinate goals — combine to produce work settings that motivate and effectively direct teacher work.[3] To these factors we turn next.

Motivating and Directing the Work of Teaching

Teachers derive their deepest satisfaction in teaching from their work with students. Consequently, creating conditions in which teachers can be successful provides direct benefits to both teachers and students. If the psychic rewards of teaching are most potent, then it follows that measures to improve psychic rewards should receive top priority. The better teachers are at their work, the more rewarding they find teaching, and the more likely they are to devote effort to teaching and to remain committed to it.

These notions come together in a concept that has begun to receive attention in the research on teaching. *Teacher efficacy*, the individual's perceived expectancy of obtaining valued outcomes through personal effort, is associated with student achievement (Ashton and Webb, 1986), and is itself influenced by organizational factors (Fuller *et al.*, 1982). Teachers' sense of efficacy varies from individual to individual but is systematically related to school-level factors. A recent survey study of a large sample of elementary teachers begins to suggest what factors are involved, and is worth summarizing.

This study collected survey data from over 800 elementary teachers in seventy-eight schools in order to examine how school organizational factors influence teachers' commitment to teaching.[4] The study proposed that in schools where teachers could acquire skills necessary to good teaching, felt effective in helping students learn and felt

rewarded for their efforts, they would also develop high commitment to teaching as evidenced by positive attitudes, low absenteeism and little desire to leave teaching. Dramatic school-level differences emerged, related strongly to a number of organizational processes. In schools that support teachers and build their sense of efficacy:

> There is an emphasis on goal-setting and on developing consensus on values — what the school stands for, what 'we're trying to achieve'.
>
> Goal consensus is the outcome of frequent talk among faculty and with the principal about instruction. Teachers get together frequently — before, during and after school — to talk. The principal facilitates the process through scheduling, faculty meetings, in-service activities, etc.
>
> Teachers collaborate frequently. They observe one another, share materials, work on curriculum together and plan for the future. Crucial to this collaboration is the social meaning of help-giving and seeking. In collaborative schools, asking for and providing help is the norm modeled by the principal and experienced teachers. In isolated schools, help-seeking is construed as a sign of weakness or inadequacy; teachers learn not to ask for fear of being stigmatized as incompetent.
>
> Teachers' learning opportunities are frequent, valuable and associated with shared goals, regular feedback and evaluation, and norms of colleagueship.
>
> Principals are crucial to healthy school cultures. Through their activities and interactions with teachers they foster goal consensus; model openness, collaborative behavior and reciprocity; buffer teachers from intrusions such as the loudspeaker; establish student discipline procedures so that faculty can concentrate on teaching rather than behavior management; evaluate teachers and arrange for feedback directly and through experienced teachers; encourage the emergence of instructional leadership via delegation to lead teachers; and hire teachers who share a collaborative orientation to teaching.

In such schools teachers are more likely to develop attitudes conducive to effective teaching:

> Teachers gain in certainty about their ability to produce academic achievement in students. They develop self-esteem that is tied to successful teaching of skills and knowledge.
>
> Teachers believe that learning to teach takes a long time, that teaching cannot be mastered simply, that they must continue to work on their craft and to improve year by year;
>
> Teachers emphasize individual learning differences among children and the need to respond to such differences. If children fail to learn, teachers search for new strategies rather than 'blame the victims'.
>
> Teachers believe that teaching is a collective not an individual endeavor; they believe in help-giving and seeking, and value ideas from colleagues.
>
> Teachers identify learning as the acquisition of skills, not the unfolding of innate abilities. They believe learners are made, not born.

> Teachers associate excellence in teaching more strongly with producing academic achievement in students rather than with a range of general, diffuse developmental goals.
>
> Teachers are more willing to 'buck the system' in cases where policies conflict with their best professional judgment. Teachers do not feel powerless in the face of bureaucratic constraints.

Rosenholtz's research further reveals that collaborative schools had lower rates of teacher absenteeism and produced higher standardized test scores in reading and math, over a three-year period. Finally, neither the size nor the socio-economic status of the school predicted healthy teaching cultures. They were equally prevalent (or equally rare) across the range of communities, a surprising but heartening finding. There is no reason, it appears, why all schools might not begin moving in this direction.

Judith Little and her colleagues have built an impressive body of ethnographic research that complements this portrait of healthy teaching cultures in schools (Little, 1981, 1982, 1987; Little *et al.*, 1986; Bird and Little, 1986). This work focuses on school-wide processes that produce shared norms and work orientations. Most critical are the norms of collegiality, an expectation for shared work within a school, and of continuous improvement, an expectation for ongoing analysis, evaluation and experimentation. Careful observations in more and less successful schools (based on school-wide test scores over several years plus nominations) revealed a number of 'critical practices of adaptability' (Little, 1982):

> Teachers engage in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete and precise talk about teaching practice .... By such talk teachers build up a shared language adequate to the complexity of teaching ....
>
> Teachers are frequently observed and provided with useful (if potentially frightening) critiques of their teaching. Such observation and feedback provide shared referents for the shared language of teaching.
>
> Teachers plan, design, research, evaluate, and prepare teaching materials together .... By joint work on materials, teachers share the considerable burden of development required by long-term improvement, confirm their emerging understanding of their approach, and make rising standards for their work attainable by them and by their students.
>
> Teachers teach each other the practice of teaching. In the most adaptable schools, most staff, at one time or another, on some topic or task, are permitted and encouraged to play the role of instructor for others. (p. 331)

These practices do not develop by accident. Organizational structures and processes encourage and insist on such behavior. Principals, once again, are critical. They model such behavior themselves, supply resources to teachers, set up routines and expectations and create organizational arrangements that facilitate collegiality and reduce teacher isolation.

In her recent work Little has begun exploring how district-level processes contribute to the emergence of teacher leadership (see Little *et al.*, 1986). Teamwork among teachers is quite fragile in many schools and often fails to survive turnover of key actors such as the

principal or lead teachers. Consequently, actions at higher levels within the system are necessary to the institutionalization of work norms and patterns that support collaboration. The superintendent's actions are critical. S/he proposes and champions collaborative arrangements, personally attends critical planning meetings, holds principals to expectations, allocates resources and models collaborative behavior for management. Specific support factors such as mutual time for planning and training for key personnel are important as are formal roles and staffing patterns to support various forms of teamwork.

The image of a successful school rising out of this work fits well with many of the generalizations from the effective schools literature (see Purkey and Smith, 1983; Rutter, 1983; and Rosenholtz, 1985, for reviews). This literature emphasizes that 'good schools' are tightly coupled: there is consensus among faculty on goals; there are procedures to measure and track goal attainment; expectations for achievement are high; and curriculum is well coordinated. To achieve these desirable features requires collaboration among teachers, regular feedback and evaluation, and precision in the shared language of teaching. In such schools teachers' sense of efficacy is high, and consequently they feel rewarded in their work. The ambiguities, uncertainties and loose coupling that the constraint perspective suggests are widespread seem to be substantially reduced in some schools, making the work of teaching more satisfying, more rewarding and more effective. But, most commentators agree, there are not enough such schools. They seem to be the exception, not the rule, and so we return to the original insights about teaching and its constraints.

Teaching Incentives: An Agenda for the Future

In their now sacred text Peters and Waterman (1982) cite philosopher Ernest Becker's argument that man is driven by an essential dualism: to be part of something and to stick out, to be a conforming member of a winning team and to be a star in his own right. Schools, like other work organizations, must meet both these needs if teachers are to be satisfied and productive workers. It is this simple — and this difficult.

Future research on incentives in teaching might take up any number of topics, but I want to propose three areas for further inquiry: incentives and school effectiveness; the relationship between accountability and teaching incentives; and the equity implications of incentives.

Incentives and School Effectiveness

The work of Rosenholtz and Little is valuable because it establishes connections between the social psychological processes contributing to teachers' efficacy and the sociocultural characteristics of schools as teacher worksettings. This review has emphasized that cultural characteristics of schools contribute to schooling outcomes directly and through effects on teaching's intrinsic rewards. Such features of schools are in principle alterable, are widely if not abundantly present and constitute a prime locus for future research.

Inquiry to date on effective schools, however, has been a mixed blessing. The research

has begun to identify alterable features of schools that contribute to student achievement, but in translation for use has led to new orthodoxies rather than flexible guidelines for practice. Future work must begin to differentiate and refine our conceptions of good schools to avoid the 'list logic' (Barth, 1986) that dominates current thinking.

First, research must take up differences among elementary, middle and secondary schools. Elementary schools differ considerably from high schools in their organizational properties. For example, they tend to be smaller, less specialized by subject matter and department, and to possess a more captive student clientele. Women make up the majority of elementary faculty, while high school faculties are more evenly divided by gender. These and other differences may influence systematically the character of school effectiveness, and the deployment of incentives.

Second, research must view schools in a community context. Communities vary along a variety of dimensions including wealth, socioeconomic status, racial composition and location (i.e., urban, suburban, rural). Schools must be responsive to their communities, but there are few indications how such responsiveness influences school effectiveness. Conceptions of school effectiveness must begin to take account of the fit between schools and communities rather than viewing schools as context-free, generic institutions.

Third, research might begin to identify differences among similar schools that are effective, in order to illustrate that no single formula or recipe underlies the creation and maintenance of a good school. Portraiture as a social science genre is relatively new, but Lightfoot (1983) among others already has made contributions. Such work might start with a set of common prescriptions or ingredients, then reveal how very differently these are enacted in particular schools.

Finally, future work must portray schools as dynamic organizations undergoing cycles of growth, decay and regeneration rather than as static entities comprised of properties. 'How do good schools become so?', and, 'How do they remain so?' must receive the same attention as, 'What characterizes effective schools?' We must, in short, begin to produce a film library of good schools, not just albums of snapshots.

Accountability and Teaching Incentives

The prevailing thrust of much policy-driven change is to legislate better teaching. This takes the form of more regulation, more tests, more curriculum specifications, more reporting requirements for teachers, in short, more external accountability. Such an approach attempts to improve school effectiveness by prescribing the goals of schooling and translating them into measurable results. Goal clarity and high expectations are certainly desirable as the school effectiveness literature testifies, but a single-minded emphasis on accountability is not likely to inspire teachers. In fact, our best teachers may find external controls most burdensome and diverting (Darling-Hammond, 1984), and some interesting experimental evidence suggests the costs of heavy-handed accountability.

Edward Deci and his colleagues hypothesized that when teachers are placed in highly controlling environments that reduce their autonomy and emphasize conformity to external rewards and punishments, they will in turn become more controlling with

students. They tested this hypothesis by asking forty people to instruct a group of students in solving puzzles (Deci and Ryan, 1985):

> Results . . . revealed that teachers in the performance-standards condition made twice as many utterances, spent twice as much time talking, and allowed students to work alone much less than did the no-standards teachers. They also gave three times as many directives, made three times as many should-type statements, and asked twice as many controlling questions as did the no-standards teachers. Further, the performance-standard teachers were rated as being more demanding and controlling, as giving students less choice and less time to work alone, and as being less effective in promoting conceptual learning, than the no-standards teachers. Finally, the raters indicated that they would prefer to be taught by the no-standards teachers. (p. 267)

Other experimental research supports this study, but the results are more eye-opening than definitive. The description of controlling teachers sounds remarkably like the portrayal of classroom life in John Goodlad's study (1984). Deci goes on to point out other sources of controlling behavior in teachers, including rowdy, disruptive students, but the implications are clear. If we genuinely expect teachers to encourage creativity, higher order reasoning and autonomy in students, then placing them in regulated environments will be a disaster.

There appear to be two extremes to avoid. One is direction without support, where goals are specified and accountability mechanisms put in place but teachers are treated as low-level bureaucrats expected to carry out orders. This is *not* what the effective schools literature recommends, yet it is what a lot of educational policy looks like today. The other extreme is support without direction, where teachers are given freedom to experiment but little guidance about goals. This was the drift in the 1960s with the cafeteria-style curriculum and the tacit sanctioning of treaties, deals and bargains between teachers and students. Peters and Waterman conclude their book with a chapter on the 'simultaneous loose-tight properties' of effective companies. This is the elusive mix in organizational cultures of shared values, constant, swift feedback on results and attention to the client, coupled to considerable autonomy and innovation from the rank and file worker. School environments that get this mix right empower teachers while reducing their anxiety and uncertainty about results.

Little research has been done on how accountability mechanisms affect teachers. Experiments of the sort carried out by Deci are suggestive, but are low on ecological validity. It is important to understand the circumstances in which common accountability mechanisms serve as disincentives for teachers. A useful line of research would explore the effects of accountability and control procedures on teachers' motivation, morale and effectiveness. Field studies might draw on the hypotheses and concepts derived from the psychological literature on rewards and incentives.

Equity and Teaching Incentives

Teaching incentives have equity implications. The distribution of incentives that affect

teacher recruitment, retention and effectiveness is critical to educational equity. The current system is inequitable at every level: between states, between districts within states, and often between schools within districts. Where a student lives predicts the quality of education he receives; where a teacher teaches predicts the quality of teacher worklife. Consequently, research must attend to the distribution and redistribution of incentives.

Research on incentives can attend to equity in several ways. One is to study the equity-related consequences of incentive-based policy. If, for example, states allocate funds for teacher salaries, merit pay, career ladders or similar programs, follow-up studies should determine whether the state formulas widen, narrow or hold constant salary disparities across districts. Efforts should be made to ensure that the rich do not get richer while the poor get poorer or stay the same.

A second priority would be to initiate and study interventions that mix pecuniary and non-pecuniary incentives for attracting teachers to hard-to-staff schools. Policy to date has not been especially innovative in this regard. Combat pay and various categorical program monies have not proven effective. Clearly, special measures must be initiated to encourage teaching in inner-city and rurally isolated schools. Bonus pay may be part of the solution, but only in combination with attention to school resources, structures and cultures. Research might evaluate various schemes, and attempt to understand how teachers trade off such factors as salary increases, reduced class sizes, fewer classes and more time for planning, access to better teaching resources and materials, improvements in the physical plant, increased autonomy and other teaching 'valuables'.

There is a tendency to think of incentives in simplistic terms as directives with rewards attached to them. Yet the concept of incentives is useful because it encourages policy-makers to attend to the people — teachers mostly — who must carry out policies. But as this review has attempted to illustrate, the interplay of incentives, motivation and behavior — both individual and collective — is quite complex. There are no simple ways to improve teaching through manipulation of incentives. The incentive structure of teaching is difficult to change on a large-scale basis. But there are some promising leads in the research literature and some exemplars to follow. Thinking about incentives can help improve effectiveness, accountability and equity in teaching.

Notes

1 These observations are drawn from an unpublished report by Donald Erickson and Richard Nault, 'Currency, Choice, and Commitment: An Exploratory Study of the Effects of Public Money and Related Regulation on Canadian Catholic Schools: Research Report Submitted to the Spencer Foundation', January 1978.

2 An unpublished paper by Phil Schlechty, 'Schools for the 21st Century: The Conditions for Invention', delivered at a conference at Stanford University, 4 November 1986.

3 These findings are drawn from a draft report by Samuel Bacharach and associates, 'The Learning Workplace: The Conditions and Resources of Teaching', Washington: National Education Association, April 1986.

4 These findings are reported in draft chapters of a book by Susan Rosenholtz, *Teachers' Workplace: The Social Organization of Schools*. (1989) New York: Longman Inc.

References

ASHTON, P. A. and WEBB, R. B. (1986) *Making a Difference, Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Student Achievement*. New York: Longman.

BARNARD, C. (1938) *Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

BARTH, R. (1986) 'On Sheep and Goats and School Reform,' *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68: 293–6.

BEM, D. (1972) 'Self-Perception Theory,' in L. BERKOWITZ (ed.) *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 6. New York: Academic Press, pp. 1–62.

BERLAK, A. and BERLAK, H. (1981) *Dilemmas of Schooling: Teaching and Social Change*. London: Methuen.

BIRD, T. and LITTLE, J. W. (1986) 'How Schools Organize the Teaching Occupation,' *Elementary School Journal*, 86 (4): 493–512.

BRUNO, J. E. (1986) 'Teacher Compensation and Incentive Programs for Large Urban School Districts,' *Elementary School Journal*, 86 (4): 425–48.

CUSICK, P. A. (1983) *The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School*. New York: Longman.

CUSICK, P. A. (1985) 'Finding Meaning in Teaching: Teachers' Vision of Their School,' *Education and Urban Society*, 17 (3): 355–64.

DARLING-HAMMOND, L. (1984) 'Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching.' Rand Corporation, R-3177-RC, July.

DECI, E. L. and RYAN, R. M. (1985) *Instrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.

EAGLETON INSTITUTE (1986) 'The New Jersey Public School Teacher: A View of the Profession.' New Brunswick, N.J.: Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, June.

EBERTS, R. W. and STONE, J. A. (1984) *Unions and Public Schools*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

ELMORE, R. F. (1986) 'Choice in Public Education' (JNE-01), Paper prepared for the Center for Policy Research in Education, December.

FERRIS, J. and WINKLER, D. (1986) 'Teacher Compensation and the Supply of Teachers,' *Elementary School Journal*, 86 (4): 389–404.

FULLER, B., WOOD, K., RAPOPORT, T. and DORNBUSCH, S. M. (1982) 'The Organizational Context of Individual Efficacy,' *Review of Educational Research*, 52 (1): 7–30.

GEER, B. (1966) 'Occupational Commitment and the Teaching Profession,' *School Review*, 74 (1): 221–34.

GOODLAD, J. (1984) *A Place Called School*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

HERZBERG, F., MAUSNER, B. and SNYDERMAN, B. (1959) *Work Motivation*. London: Chapman and Hall.

HIRSCHMAN, A. O. (1970) *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

JOHNSON, S. M. (1986) 'Incentives for Teachers: What Motivates, What Matters?' *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22 (3): 17–31.

KATZ, D. and KAHN, R. L. (1978) *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley.

KOPPICH, J., GERRITZ, W. and GUTHRIE, J. W. (1985) 'California Teachers' Opinions on Working Conditions and Reform Proposals.' Berkeley, CA: University of California, School of Education, October.

KOTTKAMP, R. B., PROVENZO, E. F. and COHN, M. M. (1986) 'Stability and Change in a Profession: Two Decades of Teacher Attitudes, 1964–1984,' *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67 (8). 559–67.

LAMPERT, M. (1985) 'How Do Teachers Manage to Teach?' *Harvard Education Review*, 55 (2): 178–94.

LEPPER, M. R. and GREENE, D. (Eds) (1978) *The Hidden Costs of Reward*. Morristown, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

LEVIN, H. M. (1985) 'Solving the Shortage of Mathematics and Science Teachers' (Project Report No. 85-A2). Stanford, CA: Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, January.

LIGHTFOOT, S. (1983) *The Good High School*. New York: Basic Books.

LIPSKY, M. (1980) *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

LITTLE, J. W. (1981) *School Success and Staff Development: The Role of Staff Development in Urban Desegregated Schools*. Boulder, CO: Center for Action Research, Inc.

LITTLE, J. W. (1982) 'Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions of School Success,' *American Educational Research Journal*, 19 (2): 325–40.

LITTLE, J. W. (1987) 'Teachers as Colleagues,' in V. KOEHLER (ed.), *Educator's Handbook: Research into Practice*. New York: Longman.

LITTLE, J. W., LONG, C. and GUILKEY-AMADO, J. (1986) 'Expanding Professional Collaboration in Schools: Can Districts Organize Leadership by Teachers?' San Francisco, CA: Far West Lab, January.

LORTIE, D. (1975) *Schoolteacher*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

LORTIE, D. (1986) 'Teacher Status in Dade County: A Case of Structural Strain?' *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67 (8): 568–75.

MCLAUGHLIN, M., PFEIFER, S., SWANSON-OWENS, D. and YEE, S. (1986) 'Why Teachers Won't Teach,' *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67 (6): 420–5.

MANSKI, C. F. (1985) 'Academic Ability, Earnings, and the Decision to Become a Teacher: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972.' Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper No. 1539.

METROPOLITAN LIFE (1985) 'The American Teacher, 1985. Strengthening the Profession.' New York: Metropolitan Life.

METROPOLITAN LIFE (1986) 'The American Teacher, 1986. Restructuring the Teaching Profession.' New York: Metropolitan Life.

MEYER, J. W. and ROWAN, R. (1977) 'Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony,' *American Journal of Sociology*, 83: 340–63.

MITCHELL, D. E., ORTIZ, F. I. and MITCHELL, T. K. (1982) 'Controlling the Impact of Rewards and Incentives on Teacher Task Performance.' Final Report (NIE-G-80-0154). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, December.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION (1982) *Status of the American Public School Teacher, 1980–81*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

ODDEN, A. (1986) 'The School Financial Context of State Policies Designed to Enhance the Teaching Profession,' *Elementary School Journal*, 86 (4): 369–88.

PARSONS, T. V. (1958) 'Some Ingredients of a General Theory of Organization,' in A. W. HALPIN (ed.), *Administrative Theory in Education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, pp. 40–72.

PESHKIN, A. (1986) *God's Choice. The Total World of a Fundamentalist Christian School*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

PETERS, T. J. and WATERMAN, R. H. (1982) *In Search of Excellence*. New York: Harper and Row.

PFEFFER, J. (1982) *Organizations and Organization Theory*. Boston, MA: Pitman.

PINCUS, J. (1974) 'Incentives for Innovation in the Public Schools,' *Review of Educational Research*, 44 (1): 113–44.

POWELL, A. G., FARRAR, E. and COHEN, D. (1985) *The Shopping Mall High School*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

PURKEY, S. C. and SMITH, M. S. (1983) 'Effective Schools: A Review,' *Elementary School Journal*, 83: 427–52.

ROSEN, S. (1974) 'Hedonic Prices and Implicit Markets,' *Journal of Political Economy*, 82: 34–55.

ROSENHOLTZ, S. (1985) 'Effective Schools: Interpreting the Evidence,' *American Journal of Education*, 5: 352–81.

RUTTER, M. (1983) 'School Effects on Pupil Progress: Research Findings and Policy Implications,' in L. SCHULMAN and G. SYKES (eds), *Handbook of Teaching and Policy*. New York: Longman.

SARASON, S. (1982) *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*, 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

SEDLAK, M., WHEELER, C., PULLIN, D. and CUSICK, P. (1986) *Selling Students Short: Classroom Bargains and Academic Reform in the American High School*. New York: Teachers College Press.

SIZER, T. (1984) *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School*. Boston, MS: Houghton Mifflin.

STERN, D. (1986) 'Compensation for Teachers,' *Review of Research in Education*, 13: 285–316.

TURNER, R., CAMILLI, G., KROC, R. and HOOVER, J. (1986) 'Policy Strategies, Teacher Salary Incentive, and Student Achievement: An Explanatory Model,' *Educational Researcher*, 15 (3): 5–11.

WEICK, K. E. (1976) 'Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21: 1–21.

WEICK, K. E. (1979) *The Social Psychology of Organizing*, 2nd ed. New York: Random House.

WEINER, B. (1972) *Theories of Motivation: From Mechanism to Cognition*. Chicago, IL: Markham.

ZABALZA, A. (1979) 'The Determinants of Teacher Supply,' *Review of Economic Studies*, 46 (1): 131–47.

Chapter 7

Healing Our Schools: Restoring the Heart*

Terrence E. Deal

> Early into the night that was September 8, 1971, my strong spirited wife died. She was forty years old, and in the sixteen years of our marriage she had been sick only once. Without a clear warning, without even a foreboding, I was suddenly alone with our three children. In this terrible moment, I brought them together in our family room and heard myself say, 'Mom didn't make it. She died.' (Lindeman, 1974, p. 275)
>
> But now that I know that I no longer live as a Catholic in a Catholic world, I cannot expect the liturgy — which reflects and cultivates my faith — to remain what it was. I will continue to go to the English mass. I will go because it is my liturgy. I will, however, often recall with nostalgia the faith that I have lost. And I will be uneasy knowing that the old faith was lost as much by choice as it was inevitably lost. . . . The Catholic church of my youth mediated with special grace between the public and private realms of my life, such was the extent of its faith in itself. That church is no longer mine. I cling to the new Catholic church. Though it leaves me unsatisfied, I fear giving it up, falling through space. (Rodriguez, 1982, pp. 107–9)

In the personal and religious aspects of life it is easy to recognize the wrenching emotional and spiritual impact of loss. We become attached to people we love, and the death of a loved one leaves a personal void. We attach ourselves to the enduring symbols of religion, and any change in them creates a spiritual vacuum. Most of us can recall vividly the pain such experiences cause. Memories of loss haunt us throughout our lives, despite conscious or unconscious defences or denial. We grieve over the loss of anything we value long after the object or symbol is actually gone.

* This chapter is adapted from Chapter 15, 'Cultural Change: Opportunity, Silent Killer or Metamorphosis' in R. Kirkman, M. Saxton and R. Serpa, *Gaining Control of the Corporate Culture* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1985) 292–331.

The Human Side of Organizations

In our professional lives, however, we rarely think about loss in this way. Organizations, after all, are intentionally rational instruments, created primarily to accomplish desirable goals. In pursuing goals, people are assigned to formal roles within a well defined structure of responsibilities and relationships. In many organizations, what people contribute to the bottom line of profits or test scores has become more important than who they are or what they represent. When we leave our spiritual, fraternal or personal lives and cross the boundary of work organizations, the awareness of basic needs tend to diminish or vanish beside goals and tangible outcomes (Argyris, 1984). We become employers, teachers, managers, principals or executives — ostensibly immune to deeper human emotions. We rarely recognize that changes in the nature of work also create losses that trigger powerful individual or collective reactions. The costs may not be immediately obvious nor reflected directly in tangible ways, but left unattended over time, pressure builds up and can become a silent killer in organizations — much like hypertension in the human body. The unresolved loss of title or office can cause personal maladjustments, such as depression or excessive drinking; the substitution of a computerized system for manual procedures can create uncertainty, confusion and a loss of identity. Wholesale changes in an organization can dramatically affect overall morale, productivity and turnover. Most often, however, we fail to link those effects to the real cause. We attribute the blame to personal or other intangible sources, rather than to change in the work setting.

In *Corporate Cultures* (Deal and Kennedy, 1982) Allen Kennedy and I discuss the difficulty in changing business organizations:

> Change always threatens a culture. People form strong attachments to heroes, legends, the rituals of daily life, the hoopla of extravaganza and ceremonies — all the symbols and settings of the workplace. Change strips down these relationships and leaves employees confused, insecure, and often angry. For example, the simple installation of a computerized inventory system can dramatically alter work rituals and can cause great anxiety . . . .
>
> Many times the hidden cultural barriers to change are overlooked. New CEOs may realign their organizations, but in the process may topple heroes that people have revered since the company began. A strategic review may launch a new business strategy or new acquisition, but may miss the fact that these new initiatives undermine important values that have guided a company for years and years. Unless something can be done to reduce such threats and provide support for transitions from old to the new, the force of the culture can neutralize and emasculate a proposed change. (pp. 157–8)

The Hidden Problem of Change

In those two short paragraphs my coauthor and I introduced a germ of an important idea: cultural change typically creates significant individual and collective loss. We did not then fully realize the power of the idea. The deeper realization came during a presentation to a

Bell operating company shortly after the announcement of the divestiture of American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T). Addressing an audience of 200 Bell managers, I talked about corporate culture and the potential impact of its loss. I amplified the points from the book without fully knowing the situation or the sentiments within the group. In the midst of the session I realized that this was not a typical presentation to a detached crowd. Most of the people in the audience had tears in their eyes. The room was painfully hushed. At the end of the presentation several of the participants lined up to continue the conversation; they wanted to tell me how the change was affecting them personally. Many were visibly anguished. All reported the agony of 'being pulled apart inside'. I was overwhelmed with the pain the people reported and very concerned about how their loss might be resolved.

My experiences in subsequent years, as I visited hospitals, companies and schools across the country, have revealed even more dramatically the deeper issues of cultural change. AT&T, because of its strong culture nourished over more than 100 years, offers a most poignant example:

> A large division of AT&T. Several hundred people attending an occasion to mark the transition from comfortable tradition to an uncertain future. The final night was an elaborate ceremony of food and frolic. At the height of the festivities, a group entered with a small coffin with the words 'Ma Bell' written on the outside. The reaction was electric, but unspoken. Some laughed, some cried. That night I had a death dream. Hearses carrying loved ones I'd known passed in review, each person waving goodbye. I had somehow internalized the collective sentiments. (Deal and Kennedy, 1984, p. 16).

But other organizations in the aftermath of mergers, executive succession, innovation, growth or decline have shown that the power of cultural change is not confined to the Bell system, as the following experience shows:

> A superintendent retired from a large school system. He refused to have a going away party in his honor — a wake to mark his departure. A visit to the district six months later revealed a large number of people who still had not come to terms with his departure. This successor was not really the superintendent even though the torch formally had been passed. People were hanging on when they needed to let go and move on. They conspired to bring him back, so they could mourn his passing.
>
> As part of the district-wide consolidation plan, an elementary school in a southeastern school district was to be closed and torn down. On the school's last day, a formal ceremony brought teachers, students, administrators, parents, graduates, and former employees, together for the final rites. During the ceremony, teachers, students, and others shared favorite memories of the school. The principal then gave a signal and the custodial staff wrapped a large red ribbon around the school's entire brick walled perimeter. The entire event was videotaped, including aerial shots of the ribbon-wrapping, taken from a helicopter. The next day, the school was demolished. Later each participant

received a video-tape of the closing event along with a brick from the school — wrapped with a red ribbon.

Wounds and Healing: The Chapter's Themes

In these examples the two themes of this chapter begin to crystallize. The first is the deep sense of individual and collective loss and grief that lurks below the surface of cultural change. Death or life without meaning are fundamental fears of the human species (Becker, 1973). Cultural change can tap into both. The second theme is the need for cultural rituals — collective events that assuage deep fears, heal wounds, mend tears in the fabric of shared meaning and graft onto old roots new forms equal to contemporary challenges. Historically rituals and ceremonies have helped humans create and celebrate the social fictions culture expresses. Symbolic events create collective energy that heals and bonds (Katz, 1982). Their absence in modern society and organizations has thrust the brunt of creating meaning onto isolated individuals, a task to which only the most talented and heroic among us are equal.

This chapter will attempt to develop both of these themes: change as loss, and ritual as respite or repair — and relate them to changes in education. Although we have been trying to change schools for decades, the patterns and practices seem strikingly familiar. But below the surface, on the cusp of consciousness, efforts to improve schools may have caused them harm. If so, we need to recognize and repair the damage. The discussion will draw from several bodies of literature as well as from the author's experience in working with businesses, hospitals, schools and other organizations. It will attempt to fuse organizational theory with the phenomenology of organizations, to link the literature with clinical observations. A moral emerges from the fusion: ignoring the silent, deep consequences of cultural change causes unnecessary personal suffering and pain. Over time a succession of unresolved changes and experiences can unravel the fabric that holds a society or its schools together. Even in a culture like America's, where innovation is a core value, too much change too fast can sever the connection between past and present and future. In the absence of social devices to reconnect roots with immediate experience and long-term vision, a people can falter or fall. The negative effects of change are particularly disturbing in educational organizations. School are society's institutions for developing future generations. Weakened by decades of change, schools may lose their moral fiber, ultimately severing the connection between America's generations — and its future.

The Carousel of Change

For the past two decades most American organizations have conducted business or rendered services in a fast-moving, turbulent environment. This is not surprising, given America's preoccupation with new things and the challenge of new frontiers. But the ongoing cultural press for newness and growth has fused with some sharp new economic, demographic and political developments. These contemporary shifts are not confined within the boundaries of the United States; they are global trends that affect organizations throughout the world.

The result is what many commentators describe as a dizzying carousel of circumstances. Among these are technical advances, new government policies, soaring inflation rates, fierce competition and a new breed of employers and managers. The revolution brewing since the introduction of computers into the workplace and the confusion caused by government deregulation provide striking examples. But countless numbers of equally powerful events have created a topsy-turvy world outside organizations that requires constant attention within (Toffler, 1970).

Educational organizations have been buffeted by the waves of change and external pressures for reform seemingly forever. But the intensity of the past three decades seems particularly significant. The 1950s brought pressures for differentiated staffing, modular scheduling and variable class groupings. During the 1960s open space, team teaching, individualized instruction and alternative education were among the desired changes. The 1970s continued many of these innovations and added vouchers, computers and modern management approaches. The 1980s has pulled from the previous decades, recycling changes into a national reform movement, now entering its second 'wave'. In its wake the decades of change, improvement and reform have left many educators — consciously or otherwise — confused, exhausted and disillusioned.

There would be some solace if the turmoil were temporary. But if the predictions of John Naisbitt (1982) are even roughly on target, we can expect the future to be even more tumultuous than the present or past. Naisbitt's key points suggest that this is only the beginning:

> We have changed to an economy based on the creation and distribution of information (even though we think otherwise).
>
> We must now acknowledge that we are part of a global economy. We have begun to let go of our ideas and must remain an industrial leader as we move on to other tasks.
>
> We are restructuring from a society run by short-term considerations and rewards to one that emphasizes long-term considerations.
>
> We have rediscovered the ability to act innovatively and to achieve results from the bottom up.
>
> We are shifting from reliance on institutional help to self-reliance.
>
> We are giving up our dependence on hierarchical structures in favor of informed networks.
>
> More Americans are leaving behind the old industrial cities of the north in favor of the south and the west.
>
> From a society confined by the limited range of personal choices embedded in the narrowly defined world of the city, state or other political entity, we are exploding into a free-wheeling, multiple-option society.

All of these predictions imply that what we are experiencing now is only the tip of the iceberg underneath. These trends suggest a major restructuring of all organizations, including schools. These trends require a major revolution in our thinking and behavior. We seem to be on the brink of having to transform ourselves and the culture of our

organizations and society. This is not a task that human beings have ever relished, let alone enthusiastically embraced.

Culture and Change: A Basic Contradiction

It is often easier to meet unique challenges with fresh, new institutions. New organizational forms bring new ways, unencumbered by assumptions and patterns of the past. Tandem and other newly formed computer companies, for instance, have set examples for both productivity and innovative ways of organizing work; Nissan of America has shown in its new automobile factory in Smyrna, Tennessee, that Americans can meet and surpass Japanese standards of automobile quality. Alternative schools of the 1960s demonstrated their ability to deal with student needs more effectively than their traditional counterparts (Deal, 1988).

Unfortunately, however, the opportunity to start organizations has to begin where they are, with what they already have. They will, of necessity, face new challenges with traditions developed and nourished under different conditions. The old ways will not be transformed easily, unless the old ways are clearly inadequate for a majority of people. Lee Iaccoca did not inherit a vigorous and productive company (Iaccoca, 1984); Chrysler was in a crisis, and most inside the company knew it. Chrysler was certainly more malleable than the Bell System, a company that over a long period delivered successfully the most advanced telephone service in the world (Tunstall, 1985; Von Auw, 1983). The difference between Bell and Chrysler was the strength of the existing cultures. Weak cultures are tough to change; strong cultures are nearly impossible. Schools seem to move as easily as a large oil tanker at dock can be pushed by someone standing on a pier. They change so slowly that it almost requires a Rip Van Winkle figure to witness a complete turn-around. The difficulty and pace are predictable. Changing any organization runs afoul of the very human creation that provides stability and contributes to success: its culture. The deep symbiotic relations between schools and external constituencies such as parents or alumni makes the problem even more difficult (Clark, 1975).

Organizational culture is not a new concept. The symbolic side of organizations has a long tradition in the literature and lore of organizational studies under a variety of names: climate (Halpin and Craft, 1962), institutions (Selznick, 1949), ideology (Weber, 1946), saga (Clark, 1975), ethos (Rutter *et al.*, 1979) or clans (Ouchi, 1980). Culture is a concept that captures the subtle, elusive, intangible, largely unconscious force that shape a society or a workplace. Culture is a social fiction created by people to give meaning to work and life (Barnard, 1938). It is a potent shaper of human thought and behavior within organizations and even beyond its boundaries.

Others, including Allen Kennedy and myself, have offered definitions of culture. These range from more scientific definitions (Schein, 1985), on the one hand, to commonsense definitions on the other: 'the way we do things around here' or 'what keeps the herd moving roughly west' (Deal and Kennedy, 1982). At the heart of most of these definitions of culture is the concept of a learned pattern of unconscious (or semiconscious) thought, reflected and reinforced by behavior, that silently and powerfully shapes the experience of a people. Culture provides stability, fosters certainty, solidifies order and

predictability, and creates meaning. Change, on the other hand, creates instability and ambiguity and replaces order and predictability with disharmony and surprise (Hoffer, 1963). Even in organizations such as Digital Electronics or Antioch University, where innovation is among the core values, how far an individual or group may deviate from 'the way we do things around here' is constrained by other shared values and norms.

Culture is the human invention that creates solidarity and meaning and inspires commitment and productivity (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Peters and Waterman, 1982). It actively and forcefully begins to work against an organization when changes become necessary for survival. All human beings have a basic need to make sense of this world, to feel in control and to create meaning (Kegan, 1982). When events threaten meaning, human beings react defensively. When events rupture meaning, people will do almost anything to recapture the status quo, to restore their existential pillars. A simple example can be found in perception experiments where suits and colors are altered on playing cards: red clubs and spades, black diamonds and hearts. As people are shown the cards quickly on a screen, they become uncomfortable. As the sequence of cards is slowed, most reverse the colors in their minds. As the sequence is slowed still further, discomfort increases — some people even leave the room (Kuhn, 1970). We see in this simple example the human relation to change even in an innocuous belief such as the color of suits of cards. Much stronger relations occur when core values or beliefs are threatened or challenged — for example, when scientists are required to question paradigms (Kuhn, 1970), when people are asked to change eating or smoking habits, when new educational practices are developed to replace old ones, or when the techniques of modern management are substituted for intuition or judgment. On the positive side of organizational change lie some institutional patterns far superior to their predecessors in confronting the challenges of tomorrow — and possibly even those of today. The inefficiencies of the classroom lecture, for example, are well documented, but the practice goes on. Professors read their old notes to students who copy them in new notebooks. After the exam, the notebooks are stored, saved and restored each time a student moves. Why? Lurking on the negative side of change is the reality of human suffering and turmoil and the possibility that natural reactions to uncertainty and loss may prevent us from ever moving far beyond ourselves or our institutions. Unless we understand the process of cultural change and recognize that many of the changes we seek will result in the loss of existing cultural patterns of individual or collective meaning, we may never fully attain the organizational forms necessary to meet modern challenges. Because of their vulnerability to pressures from outside, schools will find the pathway from old patterns to new ones especially volatile. Schools must deal with sentimental attachments of parents, alumni and others as well as those of insiders.

Reconsider the language of John Naisbitt in *Megatrends* (1982) from this perspective: 'We have changed (even though we think otherwise) . . . ' 'We are moving . . . ' 'We must let go . . . ' 'We are restructuring form in favor of . . . ' 'We have rediscovered . . . ' 'We are shifting . . . ' 'We are giving up . . . ' 'More Americans are leaving behind . . . ' '. . . from narrow city/state into a multiple option society . . . '. Each prediction is a prophesy of transition, and each transition means the loss of tradition. Moving on always involves giving up and letting go. The phrases embedded in the predictions of *Megatrends* underscore the challenges of the next decade: (1) How can we deal with the uncertainty of

transition? (2) How can we cope with giving up what we need to in order to move on? These issues strike at the very heart of the key existential dilemmas of the human species. That is one of the reasons why we have not dealt with loss as the core issue of change (Becker, 1973; Marris, 1974). We attribute resistance to a lack of needed skills, problems of coping with new role expectations or conflicts arising from shifts in power (Bolman and Deal, 1984). We have defined resistance as a fundamental barrier to change without realizing what the resistance is all about. We forget the epicenter of change: shifts in cultural patterns — values, heroes and heroines, rituals, ceremonies, priests and priestesses — that create existential loss and pose a threat to meaning. From the perspective of culture, schools need to attend to transition issues, to find ways of moving effectively through the rough waters of change. If they do not, most will either become stuck in an unworkable past or mired in a meaningless present. The lessons of the past few decades provide support for a less than optimistic prophecy. Many schools are already (and unknowingly) caught in the double bind of hanging on while letting go. Many of the most embittered teachers are the ones that have been hurt the most by change.

Change as Loss: A Brief Synopsis of the Literature

Attachment is a fundamental human tendency (Freud, [1915] 1937). We attach ourselves to other people, to places, to possessions, to roles, to relatives, to pets, to cars, to work (Bolman, 1980). We form attachments for a number of reasons: attachments bring happiness and fellowship; they confer status and power; they head off loneliness; but in the most profound sense attachments create meaning, without which people lose their existential orientation and their will to go on. They lose 'heart'. When attachments are broken, we lose important objects, and even more importantly we often lose what these objects represent. Attachments make meaning; loss creates disequilibrium and grief. The process is rarely acknowledged or discussed. Marris (1974) documented the sense of loss and grief among widows and city dwellers displaced by urban renewal projects. He generalizes from these studies, arguing that similar reactions occur in response to other social or personal changes.

Change stems from different sources, each with its own set of challenges. One of the most widely documented life changes is death — unanticipated or otherwise. Death as loss of life is a moot issue for the victims (Weisman, 1976), but it is a significant issue for the survivors. Their bubble of meaning temporarily bursts. Marris' (1974) study of grieving widows illustrates how survivors react to the rupture of existential reality. They are caught between two primary impulses: one to follow the victim into the grave (clinging to the past); the other immediately to embrace the present (denying the loss). Either impulse reduces the ability of the survivor to resolve the loss of the spouse and to move ahead.

Studies of other life changes reveal similar patterns. The process of individual development or growth — moving from one ego state to another — involves letting go of one conception of the self and moving on to another. In the process people become ambivalent, alternating between ego levels until the transition is made (Kegan, 1982). In the later stages of human development aging (Neugarten and Weinstein, 1976; Warren, 1976), retiring, and entering a retirement home (Hughes, 1976) raise disconcerting

transition issues. Again the key issue is how a person moves from one state to another, how the process of letting go and moving ahead proceeds. As one man recently put it: 'I wondered why I got so depressed during my fortieth birthday party. I saw my youth slipping away and I didn't want it to pass. So many memories. I find myself holding back from aging. At the same time, I'm looking forward to the first Christmas my granddaughter rides her new bike.'

Think of other life transitions:

Educational transitions — moving from elementary school to high school to college to graduate school — involve leaving one life (or one institution) behind and adapting to another (Signell, 1976).

Adoption (Kadushin, 1976), living together (Lobsenz, 1976), marriage (Raush, Goodrich and Campbell, 1976), parenthood (Dyer, 1976) — happy events in one sense — involve significant changes in life circumstances. Less happy events — divorce (McDermott, 1976) or other broken relationships — create equally significant transition crises. Many people are simply unable to come to terms with the fact that an important relationship has been lost. They either deny that it is lost or quickly find a replacement.

Moving (Fried, 1976) or changing a place of residence (Levine, 1976) causes extreme disorientation. When the move is involuntary and the transition is to an unpleasant set of circumstances, the transition can be particularly painful, as studies of prisoners of war (Spaulding and Ford, 1976) and concentration camp inmates (Chodoff, 1976; Dinsdale, 1976; Ostwald and Bittner, 1976) dramatically document; and often the readjustment following release is as difficult as the initial adjustment (Spaulding and Ford, 1976).

Man-made disasters, such as the explosion of the atomic bomb in Japan (Janis, 1976), and natural disasters, such as tornadoes (Schanche, 1976) and floods (Birnbaum, Coplon and Scharff, 1976), create multiple losses for survivors. Adjustments after skyjacking incidents (Jacobson, 1976), the isolation of duty on a nuclear submarine (Earls, 1976) and rape (Sutherland and Scherl, 1976) are comparable.

Through all of these transitions, the core proposition stands out: change produces loss, and the loss creates grief.

Individuals respond to change and loss in predictable ways. Kubler-Ross (1969) has outlined the sequence of responses of survivors in situations where someone has died:

1 Denial — a psychologically cushioning reaction that avoids confronting the reality of the loss.
2 Anger — the response immediately following denial: Why did this happen to me (or us)? How could the person have done this to me (or us)?
3 Depression — once the anger subsides, the reality of the loss begins to sink in, producing waves of anguish and depression.
4 Bargaining — the psychological struggle to recapture or return to the lost state or object.
5 Acceptance — coming to terms with the loss and moving ahead.

There are several explanations of why people react so negatively to change. First, change produces loss, and loss creates wounds.

> When an ultimely death penetrates our sense of reality, we often respond like a micro-organism punctured by a painful injury. We withdraw, finding a psychological counterpoint to physical avoidance in denial. By denying a painful portion of immediate reality, we protect our own presence and consciousness. We simply disbelieve, repudiate anything that would threaten our enduring assumptions about reality and its key relationships. Denial is an emergency response that closes off further perceptions by means of physical and psychological numbness. Quite literally, we are wounded, having come to grief before we are prepared to mourn. (Weisman, 1976, p. 267).

Second, change shatters reality, causing us to feel out of control and undermining our sense of efficacy. Under normal circumstances most people create for themselves a feeling of psychological control. We feel that we are in control and that we can affect our surroundings. Change often creates a sense of being out of control and undermines our feeling of being able to make any difference. Thus we often withdraw from change and try to shrink our psychological space in order to recapture feelings of control and efficacy. In concentration camps, for example: 'Each [person] seemed to have constructed a small world within which he could live with a sense of native autonomy and security precisely because of its narrow boundaries' (Ostwald and Bittner, 1976, p. 369).

Third, change alters our relationships with objects, activities and symbols that give meaning to our lives and create a world that makes sense to us. In reaction to the announcement of the death of the mother cited at the beginning of this chapter the teenage son replied, ' "You know, Dad," . . . in a clear, steady voice and with his clear blue eyes as dry as a bone, "if we think long enough and hard enough about this, I suppose some day it will make sense". His statement was in reference to his mother's death — also his feelings about his world' (Lindeman, 1976, p. 279).

Victor Frankl (1963), whose experiences in Auschwitz represent the most wrenching loss imaginable, suggests the fundamental reason why change is so disorienting: 'the striving to find a meaning of one's life is the most profound motivational force in man . . . Man is able to live and even to die for the sake of his ideals and values. Man is a being whose main concern consists in fulfilling meaning and in actualizing values, rather than in the mere gratification and satisfaction of desires and instincts . . . ' (pp. 154–64). The bedrock of our lives is the symbols we create to give life meaning: 'Rob the average man of his life's illusion and you rob him of his happiness at the same stroke' (Ibsen, [1884] 1967, p. 217).

When attachments to objects or symbols are broken, people experience deep feelings of hurt, loss of control and an existential vacuum that threatens their toehold on life's meaning. But the impact is more than psychological. A scale of social readjustment also links change to physical illness (Holmes and Masuda, 1974). In this schema life changes are assigned numerical values (life change units) based upon estimates of the degree of readjustment required: death of a spouse = 100 units, divorce = 63 units, marital separation = 65 units, jail term = 63 units, marriage = 50 units, change in line of work = 36 units, son or daughter leaving home = 29 units, begin or end school = 26 units, change in

residence = 20 units, and so forth. High scores are highly predictive of the onset of disease. Thus change not only causes psychological pain; it can also trigger disease and other pathologies such as excessive drinking or mental illness.

Change and Loss in Organizations

The literature links change to loss, loss that results in some sort of human reaction. In theory, when symbols, activities or objects are changes in organizations, collections of people experience loss, but their feelings are unconscious and usually unacknowledged or displaced. In our society, more than in many others, the existence of loss and grief tends to be denied (Becker, 1973).

The change-loss-reaction sequence is especially applicable to cultural changes. Culture's primary function in organizations is to give meaning to human activity. The elements of culture — values, heroes, rituals, ceremonies, priests, priestesses, stories — are important as tangible expressions, representations and symbols of deep, unconscious thoughts and assumptions (Jung, 1958; Langer, 1951). People become attached to the elements of culture as the foundation of individual and collective meaning. When cultural elements change or are changed, people experience loss and react in much the same way as they would to the death of a spouse or the loss of a home (Marris, 1974). A shift in organizational philosophy, a succession in upper management, the alteration of management techniques or work procedures, the cancellation of an annual conference or the retirement of a number of old-time employers silently place individuals, divisions or entire companies in grief — without anyone recognizing or understanding the symptoms.

Consider some examples of cultural changes in schools:

Values

Core values, expressed in symbols and slogans, provide a shared sense of what an organization stands for. As schools have embraced new responsibilities, their sense of mission has often been diluted or forgotten. One large school system recently produced a video account of its history. Interviews with old-timers, photographs and film footage were interwoven into a decade by decade review. At the end of the program several people remarked, 'we had forgotten why we are here!' In another school district a large group of administrators was asked, 'what does this school system stand for ?' After a long silence a principal remarked, 'we pass the torch of knowledge from one generation to another!' He later apologized for being too sentimental. Accountability pressures have often equated education with achievement test scores. But test scores are not values and high test scores (or low ones) are not substitutes for a shared sense of mission and meaning.

Heroes and Heroines

Every culture needs heroes and heroines who embody values and provide tangible role models of virtue and vision. On a national level Mr Chips, Our Miss Brooks and Miss Dove once reminded everyone of the deeper values of teaching and education. Few such figures, in fact or fiction, are portrayed today. Even more troublesome, in many schools

heroes and heroines — teachers, administrators and others — depart without a trace. For example, an elderly teacher remarked a year after her retirement, 'The least they could have done is hung my picture in the faculty room.' Her colleagues shared her sentiments, 'It's not the same without Mrs Jones around here.' In another school several principals have come and gone, resulting in a cynical sense among teachers: 'We never really loved Mr Martinez and Miss Smith — and we don't want to get involved again.' In the absence of heroes or heroines some schools create devils — usually administrators — who provide cohesion by giving everyone someone to hate and rally against.

Rituals

Rituals are physical expressions of cultural values and beliefs — a dance people do to bond together and experience their common quest. Rituals do not accomplish, they express. Physicians and surgical teams scrub for seven minutes — even though germs are destroyed, by modern germicides, in thirty seconds. The ritual galvanizes the team and prepares the people for doing precision surgery. In many schools rituals have been neglected or have disappeared. In one large high school, for example, the joking and teasing around sign-in and sign-out as well as the weekly TGIF parties that once made the school a lively and meaningful place have fallen by the wayside. Although no one consciously recognizes the loss, the absence of ritual has contributed to the school's existential deterioration. Once considered a sacred ritual, the act of teaching is now labeled a task. Time on task has become a standard criterion for effective teaching. The countless innovations designed to make teaching more technical have undoubtedly weakened its symbolic importance as an act repeated again and again, stylized and full of meaning.

Ceremony

Ceremonies are episodic occasions when the culture is put on display. Values are reasserted. Heroes and heroines are annointed, reannointed and remembered. Stories are told and retold. Symbols are exchanged. In some schools ceremonies are held at the beginning and closing of the school year. In many, however, there is not a collective occasion where values and symbols are the central focus. Gatherings are held for a purpose and the purpose is often administrative detail or technical information. In one school system a new superintendent reconvened an annual gathering of the school community that had been disbanded by her predecessor. Although nearly everyone complained initially about losing a day's work at the busiest time of the school year, the unanimous conclusion at the day's end of looking backward and forward was: 'We've really missed this.'

Stories

Stories carry values and provide people with direction, courage and hope. In many schools stories have been replaced by facts or have become negative accounts of gloom and doom. One school district astonished itself by telling people, at the annual retreat, to spend an hour telling each other stories. The teachers and administrators were grouped by decade. At the end of the hour each group had its designated storyteller tell the best stories. A look

of delight in everyone's face confirmed how much the stories had been missed. Several new teachers remarked, 'now we know why we became teachers.'

Priests, Storytellers and Other Characters

The informal network of priests and priestesses, storytellers, gossips and spies is well known in most organizations — especially schools. The collective informal responsibility of their people is to carry on and protect the culture. Their importance goes beyond their formal role in the organization. That is why the departure of a secretary or cafeteria worker can be a more poignant occasion than the departure of a principal or central office administrator. The departure of a beloved cultural player leaves a tear in the fabric of meaning. In Southern California a patio commemorates a custodian who was, for years, the school's high priest. In another school a teacher lamented the loss of a librarian: 'The TGIF will never be the same without Grace. We never appreciated her stories enough while she was here. Now that she's gone, we realize how much her stories meant. There's no one that can take her place.'

Symbols

Logos and other symbols often condense the deep existential meaning of an organization. One principal recently discovered the importance of a school mascot when she removed 'Mr Meany' — a figure inconsistent with her vision of the school — from the wall by the trophy case. She put it in the basement and although no one said anything, inexplicable conflicts between students, faculty and her soon revealed the significance of her act.

The Legacy of Change

As is evident in all of these examples, changes in the elements of culture create a deep sense of personal and collective loss. The feelings are usually unconscious; the anguish churns well below the surface of a school. Explicit discussions about the relationship between change and loss typically trigger an 'aha!' or 'oh, my God!' response. When the link is called to their attention, people often break through their denial and become conscious of the hidden impact of cultural change. They are often surprised that they had not seen what was going on before. 'I knew something was wrong; I just couldn't put my finger on what it was'. Figure 1, used in presentations with Bell operating companies, graphically depicts the wholesale shifts among the elements of the culture of AT&T. When shown to groups, the slide visibly involves an emotional reaction. A personnel manager, reviewing the slide prior to a presentation, held the slide up to the light and winced, lowered the slide and with tears in his eyes remarked, 'My God, that's powerful'. P[illegible] a similar figure could be constructed for the field of education in general (see Figure 2).

	Old	New
Values	Universal Service	?
Heroes	The Committed Installer	?
Ceremonies	The Operation's Conference	?
Rituals	The Budget	?
Communications	The Memo	?
Symbol	The Bell	?

Figure 1. Cultural Change at Bell: Defining the New

But a similar figure could be constructed for the field of education in general (see Figure 2).

	Old	New
Values	'reading', 'riting, and 'rithmetic'	?
Heroes and Heroines	Mr Chips, Miss Dove	?
Ceremonies	Convocation, Graduation	?
Rituals	Saluting the Flag, TGIF, Calling Roll	?
Communications	The Blackboard	?
Symbol	The Apple	?

Figure 2. Change in Education: Defining the New

Our failure to associate cultural change with loss and to help teachers, administrators and students move through the stages of grief has created a legacy of emotional baggage in many schools. Wounds from changes of decades past fester or lie open. People struggle to find meaning in a situation that changed several years ago. People shrink their world to find control they once had and lost. Some people find comfort in memories; others find solace in the pell-mell of the present — on the job or in their personal lives. Change can be a silent killer; its effects gnaw at the marrow of American schools. As the pace of change increases, what can be done to help schools and educators change without incurring such significant hidden costs?

Death and Bereavement: Transition Rituals

> After about a half hour or so, a few of the abangans began to chip half-heartedly away at pieces of wood to make grave markers, and a few women began to construct small flower offerings for the want of anything better to do; but it was clear that the ritual was arrested and no one knew what to do next. Tension slowly rose . . . . The first requisite was stripping the corpse (which was still lying on the floor, because no one could bring himself to move it). But by now the body was rigid, making it necessary to cut the clothes off with a knife, an unusual procedure which deeply disturbed everyone, especially the

> women clustered around.... Before the washing [of the body] began, however, someone raised the question as to whether one person was enough. Wasn't it usually three? (Geertz, 1973, 156–8).

The confusion underlying this account of a burial service for a young Javanese boy was the result of a divisive, countrywide political feud. Because of the political beliefs of the boy's family, the local Modin (holy man) would not supervise the burial preparations. The boy was finally buried in the appropriate manner, but the disorganized ritual left his relatives and the community confused and divided long after the event was over.

Death as the ultimate transition is marked by ritual in all cultures. In the ritual the community comes together to grieve the loss and to reinforce the symbolic bond among the living. Without bereavement it would be impossible to accept loss or to find real meaning in the present or the future: 'The process of bereavement is a problem of coping with a wounded reality. Its aim is to facilitate healing — namely, resolution, relief, and restoration of a corrective equilibrium between reality sense and reality testing' (Weisman, 1976, p. 267).

Every culture specifies a process of bereavement. In Japan, for example, grieving widows go daily to the household altar. On the altar is a picture of the deceased and an urn holding the ashes.

> In Japan, the deceased become ancestors who are fed, watered, given gifts, talked to, and so the tie between the widow and the dead husband remains through the concrete medium of the husband's picture on the altar. The family altar is almost universal and is a cultural cultivation of the idea of the presence of the deceased. The rituals appeared to aid the widows, and although they are acutely grieving, they seemed to be adapting to the loss. They certainly required no special fantasy making since they could literally look at the picture and feel that he is alive and look at the urn of ashes and realize that he is dead. Over time the regular reminder of both the presence and departure of the husband helps the widows to adjust to the loss. (Yamamoto *et al.*, 1976, p. 302)

Loss, as noted, triggers two impulses. One is to hold onto the past, the other is to rush headlong into the present to avoid the anguish. In ritual the prescribed physical alteration between the two impulses helps people to fuse past and present and to move into a meaningful future. The bereavement ritual heals, unites, repairs and transforms. 'Bereavement has become an individual matter, with an attendant deritualization of mourning. As institutional patterns diminish, the bereaved are left increasingly to fend for themselves, with concomitant growth of uncertainty' (Harrison, Davenport and McDermott, 1976, p. 85).

Studies of death and bereavement document the importance of having small children regularly visit the grave sites of lost parents and of having widows and widowers go through the rituals of wake, funeral and resurrection (Lindeman, 1976). When the loss of a loved one is not marked by ritual, survivors become stuck between the disorganized state of wanting to recapture what they have lost and wanting to move ahead. The example of the disjointed Javanese funeral rite is applicable to our own culture. Here, however, it is not political turmoil that typically mars the bereavement process; it is our own culture's denial of death and loss (Becker, 1973).

Loss from death, however, is not the only transition that needs to be marked by ritual. Differences between the long-term reactions of Korean prisoners of war and those of the imprisoned crew of the *USS Pueblo* were traced to the way in which the two groups re-entered the culture (Spaulding and Ford, 1976). Korean POWs were sent home on a ship, a process that lasted for weeks. The Pueblo crew was flown home immediately and thereby denied the opportunity symbolically to let go and move on. The same pattern was noted among concentration camp inmates who immediately re-entered their society following their internment (Hunter, 1976).

Whether the loss is the result of a move (Fried, 1976), a disaster (Janis, 1976; Schance, 1976; Birnbaum, Coplon and Scharff, 1976), a graduation, a terminated relationship, or the natural process of human development in which a person 'loses one self and replaces it with another' (Kegan, 1982), it must be accompanied by an individual or collective process of mourning. The old is grieved at a wake and laid to rest, and after a specified time a new reconnection is celebrated. The process keeps the past and present connected as movement into the future evolves.

Cultural Change

Within rituals rules specify particular sequences of events and often call for different behavior on the part of different participants (Moore and Meyerhoff, 1977). The physical action and underlying sentiments objectify and reinforce collective beliefs and values. In mourning rituals, for example, the events and symbols are designed to evoke sadness (Weisman, 1976). As people cry together over their loss, they come together in the will to go on, to enter a future of new meaning. In death and other losses, bereavement rites are either specified or arise spontaneously. Where ultimate loss is not collectively mourned, the survivors either cling to the past or spin frenetically in a meaningless present. Much change in organizations is typically not defined as loss. Even when change is experienced as loss, the feelings are repressed or denied. As a result, rituals seldom develop to transfigure change. When rituals arise spontaneously, they are often discounted or aborted.

A central point of this chapter is that unless transition rituals permit participants to mourn loss and to transform old meaning into new, schools unknowingly become stuck in the past or mired in the meaningless activity of the present. A vital leadership task is consciously to plan rituals and to encourage ritualistic activities that arise from the spontaneous actions of individuals or groups as they struggle to come to grips with the ambiguity and loss that change produces.

Transition Rituals: Some Contemporary Examples

In the past two years this author has had the opportunity to be part of transition rituals in companies, hospitals and schools. The events usually are not labeled formally as transition rituals or funerals. They are labeled more conventionally as meetings, management retreats, executive seminars or annual conferences. The stated purpose is to accomplish some task; their implicit, unstated purpose, however, is to deal with the psychological

aftermath of significant change. The events begin to depart from typical retreats, seminars or conferences in the early stages of planning. There is an unspoken tension and an underlying sense that the event is something special. While this is rarely addressed directly, the planning process is filled with an air of drama that is evident to a sensitive outsider, if not to the participants themselves. Even when the underlying issue of loss is explicitly addressed, participants seldom anticipate the dramatic character of the event they are planning.

A group of administrators attending a two-week institute for public school principals held a closing ceremony after discussing the theory of cultural change and loss. They were losing the temporary culture created during the institute. The principals covered a table with a bedspread from one of the dormitory rooms and set two candles on it. They seated the faculty behind the table and grouped themselves in front. The room was darkened. Two people came forward to light the candles, and a tape recording of Pachelbel's *Canon* was turned on. Two other individuals walked to the back of the room and took down a large banner that read, 'Principals' Institute, 1984'. The banner was unfurled across the table, and the participants arranged themselves in a circle, each ceremonially donning his or her official Principals' Institute cap. Each person then 'passed in review', signing the banner. When the procession was finished, the banner was folded and given to the Director of the Institute. During the event everyone became aware of the power of the ritual. People were obviously moved and touched. The luncheon that followed seemed like an after-funeral gathering. Voices were hushed. People finished lunch, hugged or shook hands and left. The event was dramatic and unforgettable. Those who planned it had not anticipated the power of a well designed transition ritual.

Although the meaning of such events can often only be inferred from participants' conversations immediately afterward, follow-up conversations usually reveal that the interpretation of these events as important transition rituals is shared by others.

Some examples from schools reveal the benefits of transition rituals in dealing successfully with change in education.

> A taxpayer revolt in Massachusetts resulted in an elementary school losing seven of its youngest teachers. In the school's opening faculty meeting the principal asked his teachers to list on butcher paper those aspects of the school that were dying, dead, emerging, and alive and well. Initially the teachers focused on the dead and dying: teachers, programs, and hope. The room was hushed, tears were shed. After a half hour of sadness, the group suddenly shifted to the emerging aspects of the school. They changed to excitement and enthusiasm. The faculty and principal ended the meeting with a celebration of their spirit and high hope for the coming year.

All transition events in schools are not planned by adults. In another Massachusetts elementary school where teachers were let go in the wake of the reduction funds from the same taxpayers revolt, the students convened the transition rites.

> On primary paper with its wide lines the students in their primitive second and third grade printing wrote the names of the departed teachers. With the proper ceremonial flourish a piece of paper with each teacher's name was taped to the walls of a hallway in the school. The students named each hallway in memory of teachers who were let go.

During a meeting of the principals cabinet of a large newly built high school the question was asked: 'when you moved here from the old school, what was left behind?' After a stunned silence, the principal remarked, 'Oh my God, that's what is behind all of our troubles this fall. None of us really let go of the old building.' The principal and her staff worked with the principal and the student council to plan an event. On a fall evening the faculty, parents, students and administrators gathered at the old high school two blocks away. The history of the old school was told along with recollections from many of the people in attendance. Several mementoes from the school were loaded on a cart — including the cornerstone. In the candlelight parade the entire group returned to the new school, put each memento in a visible and permanent place and dedicated the new school.

A principal replaced a man who had been fired for incompetence. Although the predecessor had served as principal of the school for several years, his performance deteriorated in the last two. After six months in the new position, his replacement sensed that something was wrong. Although it was unspoken, there seemed to be a pall hanging over the school's spirit. A new gymnasium was just about to be completed. The principal put a committee of teachers, faculty and students together and asked them to consider naming the gym after the departed principal. This committee solicited money from the community and invited the old principal back for the dedication ceremony. The ceremony was emotional — the old principal did a masterful job with his part of the ceremony — as well as did the new principal. The next day, the school was a different and more positive place.

Managing or Dancing? Alternative Approaches to Transition

The tranquillity of an unchanging status quo is a state few people experience anymore. Whether one is the president of a business, the principal of a school, the superintendent of a school system or the head of a household, the key challenge today is how to cope with changing circumstances. Struggling with transition is a central feature of life in any organization. Most predictions suggest that social and technological innovations — as well as external demands for reform — will continue and intensify in the years and decades ahead. Rather than slow down, the scope and pace of change will quicken.

This endless series of transitions has two dimensions. One side of change is positive: by changing, human organizations continue to evolve, adapt and rethink old ways. On many fronts we have come a long way in the past decades, and the potential for progress in the future is limited only by our ability to imagine the possibilities. Change is an ideological and managerial preoccupation in America. As a people, we are continually engaged in improving, reforming, renewing, transforming and tinkering with organizations of all kinds. We enjoy the excitement and adventure of changing. We seek new forms with enthusiasm, hope and an optimism that innovations will make our work lives more productive and enjoyable. We long for the opportunities that line the future.

The other side of change, however, is less obvious and less positive. Its negative effects are hidden beneath the newness and sense of progress that change brings. We rely

on social and cultural patterns for stability and meaning. Work — whether in a factory, hospital, government agency, school or business — becomes an extension of our identities. We expect and need to be able to count on organizations like the telephone company, family, local pub, Marine Corps or neighborhood school. As circumstances shift, our individual and collective equilibrium is upset. Change wounds, both spiritually and physically. Change results in loss and calls life's meaning into question. Even change agents — those members of organizations who support the change process — feel this effect of transition.

Our natural reaction to transition has become a modern epidemic for which we have no ready remedy. We cannot be inoculated against the effects of change; there is no pill available to mute or cure the symptoms. Often we cannot even label the feelings or pinpoint the sources of this discomfort. Excitement can temporarily mask the effects of change. As modern people, we believe we should be on the cutting edge, forever in flux. We deny or avoid the deep suffering that accompanies transitions.

Consequently, as organizations change, we unknowingly become stuck — either as whirling dervishes caught up in the high-speed carousel of change or as nostalgic anachronisms who hunker down and cling to the past. In either case we cause problems for ourselves and for organizations. We need instead to move ahead without losing our roots, to transform old forms and practices into new ones without jeopardizing individual or collective meaning. How to do this is one of the most significant challenges of our century. Introducing computers into the workplace, women and minorities into the mainstream, cost consciousness into medicine and risk taking into banks and insurance companies are necessary initiatives that trigger unwanted reactions. We need to pay attention to the process of changing and to find ways of moving ahead without accumulating the residual effects of transitions.

How do we do this? There are unlimited numbers of experts who appear to have the answers. Their answers typically are managerial recipes that outline how changes should be made. The problem is that most of the recipes will not work. Recipes fail because they do not take into account either the working mental maps of educators responsible for transitions or the local terrain in which the changes are being made. All strategies reflect the assumptions of the people who develop them. We need to begin our search for better approaches to change with an examination of the various perspectives that influence our initial questions, our formulation of key issues, our remedies and our assessment of how well changes have worked. The critical issue is how managers think about change and how well their images capture the essence of transition. Becoming more conscious of our images of change is a necessary first step toward developing more effective strategies (Baldridge and Deal, 1975; Deal, 1988).

One popular approach looks at how change can be managed. This view relies heavily on the rational assumptions and techniques of modern management. Changes can be made successfully if we define the objectives clearly, plan sufficiently, control the process carefully, monitor the progress systematically and assess the outcomes objectively.

From the earlier discussion it should be clear that this approach is not equal to the challenge. The heavy emphasis on rationality minimizes the symbolic aspects of change. Why should people become disturbed when transitions are designed to move toward exciting new horizons and opportunities? Managerial emphasis on control discourages

153

events that become too messy and emotional. It is not wise to let things get out of hand. The emphasis on instrumental logic rules out expressive events that may be required to deal with existential, symbolic issues. 'Get the job done, we'll talk about it later', is the attitude often taken.

There are times when management practices may unknowingly ameliorate the trauma of change. Specifying objectives may induce a temporary vision to bolster confidence and hope. Planning may implicitly provide occasions where people can vent their grief. Task forces and meetings may help recreate shared meaning. Reports may reduce ambiguity and symbolize that changes are on the right track. But the benefits are not intended; they are accidental. When drama begins to encroach on the task at hand, many educators rush quickly to restore order and return to their main agendas. In short, managing while changing may be counterproductive.

A second approach is re-emphasizing the symbolic side of change, leaving modern management tools behind and rediscovering more fundamental structures. Flowing with transitions may symbolically be more important than trying to manage or control change. A shift in language is important. Leaders need to think about how they can convene, encourage and become active participants in rituals, social dramas and healing dances as a means of transforming modern organizations.

Ritual arises around the boundaries of the unknown. In organizations rites take several forms: rites of passage (induction), rites of degradation (firing), rites of renewal (annual retreats), rites of enhancement (seminars), rites of conflict reduction (collective bargaining) and rites of integration (birthday or holiday parties) (Trice and Beyer, 1984). Ritual has several important properties: repetition, acting, stylized behavior, order, evocative presentational style and a collective dimension of shared meaning (Moore and Meyerhoff, 1977). Ritual also has consequences. In rituals we experience a transpersonal bonding essential to the human species (Rappaport, 1978). Ritual is particularly important in transitions because of its ability to repair, soothe and transform (Langer, 1951). Ritual is never imposed; it arises naturally. Leaders can convene occasions and encourage symbolic transformations; they cannot make them happen independently of the collective will.

Social drama offers still another means of expressive and effective transition activities (Turner, 1982). A social drama begins with a breach of the norm. A crisis follows in which antagonisms become visible. To limit the crisis, adaptive and redressive mechanisms spontaneously emerge. The conclusion is a reconciliation, a *rapprochement* among the conflicting parties. Social dramas arise naturally around transitions. They need to be choreographed and dramatized to work. Leaders need to be both directors and actors to move effectively from breach to reconciliation.

A final means of symbolic transitional activity is the dance. In *Boiling Energy* Katz (1982) describes the healing dance of the Ikung, a tribe in the Dobe area of Africa straddling the borders of Namibia and Botswana. Dances are held regularly for the tribe to promote wellness, and more frequently when someone is sick. The healing dance centers on the concept of Num, a spiritual energy that can heal. Num is activated by the dance and intensified through an altered state of consciousness called Kia. With healers as media, Num becomes available to the tribe in the dance. As Katz notes: 'The healing dance is a way to deal with transitions, and the uncertainties as well as opportunities they release. Whether a person seeks to transit from sickness to health or from a known state of

consciousness to a unknown one' (p. 300). Those who manage change in modern organizations need to learn to dance, to become healers capable of releasing collective energy to heal the wounds of change.

The clinical observations cited earlier document how rituals, social dramas and healing dances arise spontaneously around transition events. In these experiences a script emerges, behavior becomes stylized, emotions rise and a drama unfolds. The experiences seems to have a life of their own, a momentum that individuals unconsciously follow, a scenario that is larger than the sum of the individual parts. It is a cocoon of human experience that produces a metamorphosis of past, present and future. Within the behavioral cocoon the organization is transformed, wounds are healed, new meaning is grafted onto the old and a new organization emerges. It is a natural process that is neither consciously planned nor formally controlled. It begins on a signal; it ends on a cue. Thereafter, the organization is 'never the same'. Social dramas, human dances, cultural rituals — all have the power to heal and transform the issues around change.

When these processes arise spontaneously, they can be orchestrated and encouraged. Many school administrators undoubtedly try to be in control, but special events require an ability to be temporarily out of control and a faith that everything will be all right. Changing and managing are incompatible. But dancing and changing may be complementary: the change requires the dance; the dance transforms the change. For many, this proposition will sound preposterous, but keep in mind that Thomas Watson, Sr., the founder of International Business Machines, once remarked, 'You must put your heart into the business and business into your heart.' Heart is not an integral part of the modern management lexicon. Yet it helps to crystallize what happens when organizations change. To lose heart is to lose confidence and meaning. For many teachers and administrators, the rapid pace of change has torn the heart out of schools. Heart will not be restored by knowledge; it can only be restored by dancing and healing. But this will require a significant shift in our thinking about how schools can be changed. At the very least we can stop running them by promoting change and reform that weakens the moral fiber of schools, thereby dampening the promise for the future ahead.

References

ARGYRIS, C. (1984) *Integrating the Individual and the Organization*. New York: Wiley.

BALDRIDGE, J. V. and DEAL, T. E. (1975) *Managing Change in Educational Organizations: Sociological Perspectives, Strategies, and Case Studies*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

BARNARD, C. (1938) *Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

BECKER, D. (1973) *The Denial of Death*. New York: Free Press.

BIRNBAUM, F., COPLON, J. and SCHARFF, I. (1976) 'Crisis Intervention After a Natural Disaster,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

BOLMAN, L. G. (1980) 'Organization Development and Limits to Growth: When Smaller Is Better, Can O. D. Help?' Unpublished paper, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University.

BOLMAN, L. G. and DEAL, T. E. (1984) *Modern Approaches to Understanding and Managing Organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

CHODOFF, P. (1976) 'The German Concentration Camp as Psychological Stress,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

CLARK, B. (1975) 'The Organizational Saga in Higher Education,' in J. V. BALDRIDGE and T. E. DEAL, *Managing Change in Educational Organizations: Sociological Perspectives, Strategies, and Case Studies*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

DEAL, T. E. (1986) 'New Images of Organizations and Leadership,' *Peabody Journal*, 63(3): 1–9.

DEAL, T. E. and KENNEDY, A. A. (1982) *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*. Reading, M.: Addison-Wesley.

DEAL, T. E. and KENNEDY, A. A. (1984) 'Tales from the Trails,' *Hospital Forum: The Journal of the Association of Western Hospitals*, May–June, pp. 16–26.

DINSDALE, J. E. (1976) 'The Coping Behavior of Nazi Concentration Camp Survivors' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

DYER, E. D. (1976) 'Parenthood as Crisis: A Re-Study,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

EARLS, J. H. (1976) 'Human Adjustment to an Exotic Environment: The Nuclear Submarine,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

FRANKL, V. (1963) *Man's Search for Meaning*. New York: Washington Square Press.

FREUD, S. (1937) 'Mourning and Melancholia,' in *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Vol. 14. London: Hogarth Press (originally published 1915).

FREUD, M. (1976) 'Grieving for a Lost Home,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

GEERTZ, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.

HALPIN, A. W. and CRAFT, D. B. (1962) *The Organizational Climate of Schools*. St Louis: Washington University Press.

HARRISON, S. I., DAVENPORT, C. W. and MCDERMOTT, J. R., JR. (1976) 'Children's Reactions to Bereavement: Adult Confusions and Misperceptions,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

HOFFER, E. (1963) *The Ordeal of Change*. New York: Harper and Row.

HOLMES, T. H. and MASUDA, M. (1974) 'Life Change and Illness Susceptibility,' in B. S. DOHRENWEND and B. P. DOHRENWEND, *Stressful Life Events: Their Nature and Effects*. New York: Wiley.

HUGHES, E. Z. (1976) 'Angry in Retirement,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

HUNTER, E. J. (1976) 'The Prisoner of War: Coping with the Stress of Isolation, in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

IACCOCA, L. (1984) *Iaccoca*. New York: Bantam Books.

IBSEN, H. (1967) 'The Wild Duck,' in O. G. BROCHETT and L. BROCHETT (ed.), *Plays for the Theater*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston (originally published 1884).

JACOBSON, S. R. (1976) 'Individual and Group Responses to Confinement in a Skyjacked Plane,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

JANIS, I. L. (1976) 'Aftermath of the Atomic Disasters,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

JUNG, C. G. (1958) *Psyche and Symbol*. New York: Doubleday.

KADUSHIN, A. (1976) 'Reversibility of Trauma: A Follow-up Study of Children Adopted When Older,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

KATZ, R. (1982) *Boiling Energy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

KEGAN, R. (1982) *The Evolving Self*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

KUBLER-ROSS, E. (1969) *On Death and Dying*. New York: Macmillan.

KUHN, T. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

LANGER, S. (1951) *Philosophy in a New Key*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

LEVINE, M. (1976) 'Residential Change and School Adjustment,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

LINDEMAN, B. (1976) 'Widower Heal Thyself,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

LOBSENZ, N. M. (1976) 'Living Together: A Newfangled Tango or an Old-Fashioned Waltz?' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

MCDERMOTT, J. F. (1976) 'Paternal Divorce in Early Childhood,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

MARRIS, P. (1974) *Loss and Change*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
MOORE, S. F. and MEYERHOFF, B. G. (1977) *Secular Ritual*. Amdsterdam: Van Gorcum.
MOOS, R. H. (ed.) *Human Adaptation: Coping with Life Crises*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
NAISBITT, J. (1982) *Megatrends: Ten New Directions Transforming Our Lives*. New York: Warner.
NEUGARTEN, B. L. and WEINSTEIN, K. K. (1976) 'Developmental Life Transitions: Retirement and Aging,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*
OSTWALD, P. and BITTNER, E. (1976) 'Life Adjustment After Severe Persecution,' in R. H. MOOS, (ed.), *op. cit.*
OUCHI, W. G. (1980) 'Markets, Bureaucracies, and Class,' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25: 129–41.
PETERS, T. J. and WATERMAN, R. H., JR. (1982) *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies*. New York: Harper and Row.
RAPPAPORT, R. (1978) 'Adaptation and the Structure of Ritual,' in N. BLURTON JONES and V. REYNOLDS (eds.), *Human Behavior and Adaptation*, Vol. 38, London: Taylor and Francis.
RAUSH, H. R., GOODRICH, W. and CAMPBELL, J. R. (1976) 'Adaptation to the First Years of Marriage,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*
RODRIGUEZ, R. (1982) *Hunger of Memory*. Boston, M: David R. Godine.
RUTTER, M., *et al.* (1979) *Fifteen Thousand Hours*. Cambridge, M.: Harvard University Press.
SCHANCHE, D. A. (1976) 'The Emotional Aftermath of "The Largest Tornado Ever",' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*
SCHEIN, E. H. (1985) *Organizational Culture and Leadership: A Dynamic View*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
SELZNICK, P. (1949) *TVA and the Grass Roots*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
SIGNELL, K. A. (1976) 'Kindergarten Entry: A Preventive Approach to Community Mental Health,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*
SPAULDING, R. C. and FORD, C. V. (1976) 'The Pueblo Incident: Psychological Reactions to the Stresses of Imprisonment and Repatriation,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*
SUTHERLAND, S. and SCHERL, D. J. (1976) 'Patterns of Response among Victims of Rape,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*
TOFFLER, A. (1970) *Future Shock*. New York: Random House.
TRICE, H. M. and BEYER, J. M. (1984) 'Studying Organizational Cultures through Rites and Ceremonies,' *Academy of Management Review*, 9(4): 653–69.
TUNSTALL, W. B. (1985) *Disconnecting Parties: Managing the Bell System Break-up; An Inside View*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
TURNER, V. (1982) *From Ritual to Theater*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.
VON AUW, A. (1983) *Heritage and Destiny*. New York: Praeger.
WARREN, H. H. (1976) 'Self-Perception of Independence among Urban Elderly,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*
WEBER, M. (1946) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Ed. by H. B. GERTH and C. W. MILLS. New York: Oxford University Press.
WEISMAN, A. D. (1976) 'Coping with Untimely Death,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*
YAMAMOTO, J., OKONOGI, K., IWASAKI, T. and YOSHIMURA, S. (1976) 'Mourning in Japan,' in R. H. MOOS (ed.), *op. cit.*

PART III

Changing the Roles, Relationships and the Culture of Schools

Chapter 8

The Social Realities of Teaching*

Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller

> Whatever contributes to understanding also contributes to reconstruction. (Willard Waller, 1967)

The Nature of Teaching

We have developed a set of understandings about the nature of teaching as a profession based on the literature, current research, our work with teachers and reflections on our own experiences. We label the set of phenomena we are about to describe as 'social system understandings' because they reflect the interplay between individual teacher experiences and the social context of schools. These understandings serve as a basis for discussing generalizations about the way teachers learn their jobs, become teachers and forge a professional identity.

Style Is Personalized

Teachers are faced with a central contradiction in their work, a contradiction that makes it incumbent upon each one of them to develop a style that is individual and personal. The contradiction stated simply is this: teachers have to deal with a group of students and teach them something and, at the same time, deal with each child as an individual. The teachers, then, have two missions: one universal and cognitive; the other particular and affective. The cognitive mission demands a repertoire of skills in moving a group and making sure that knowledge builds, extends and is learned. The affective mission requires that teachers somehow make friends with their students, motivate them, arouse their interest and engage them on a personal level. To deal with this contradiction, teachers develop all kinds of strategies and then meld them together into a style that is highly personal, if not idiosyncratic. This style, forged in the dailiness of work developed from trial and error,

*This chapter was published originally in Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller (1984) *Teachers, Their World, and Their Work*, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, VA: 1–15.

becomes one's professional identity and, as such, may be militantly protected and defended.

Rewards Are Derived from Students

The greatest satisfaction for a teacher is the feeling of being rewarded by one's students. In fact, most of the time the students are the *only* source of rewards for most teachers. Isolated in their own classrooms, teachers receive feedback for their efforts from the words, expressions, behaviors and suggestions of the students. By doing well on a test, sharing a confidence, performing a task, indicating an interest and reporting the effects of a teacher's influence, students let teachers know that they are doing a good job and are appreciated. Unlike other professionals who look to colleagues and supervisors for such feedback, teachers can only turn to children.

Teaching and Learning Links Are Uncertain

Dan Lortie (1965) has said that teaching is fraught with 'endemic uncertainties'. No uncertainty is greater than the one that surrounds the connection between teaching and learning. A teacher does his or her best, develops curricula, tries new approaches, works with individuals and groups and yet never knows for sure what are the effects. One hopes the children will get it, but one is never sure. A teacher operates out of a kind of blind faith that with enough in the way of planning, rational schemes, objectives and learning activities some learning will take place. But a teacher also knows that some learnings happen that are significant and never planned for and that other learnings never take hold, despite the best of professional intentions.

The Knowledge Base Is Weak

Throughout their careers teachers seek professional knowledge. In preparation a teacher-to-be takes numerous courses in the theory and the practice of education — most of which are judged as irrelevant upon entering teaching. As a bona fide teacher, one takes even more courses to earn permanent certification. In addition there is a plethora of 'staff development' offerings made available and often mandated on the district level. With some exceptions this in-service work is given the same low grades for relevance and helpfulness as is early pre-professional preparation. The sad fact is that, as a profession, we have not been able to codify teaching under a variety of contingencies in a way that is satisfying to practitioners. The knowledge base in teaching is weak; there is simply no consensus (as there is in medicine and law) about what is basic to the practice of the profession.

Goals Are Vague and Conflicting

Although there is much talk of late about goal specificity and accountability, it is still the case that the goals of education are vague and often in conflict. Are we out to impart basic skills or to enrich lives? Do we concentrate on the individual or concern ourselves with the development of the group? Are we teaching to minimal levels of competence, or are we working to develop a wide range of talents and possibilities? Do we most value discipline or learning, order and control or intellectual curiosity? Are we socializing students, or are we educating them? The answer to these questions and to others like them is usually, 'Yes, we are doing both.' The result is that individual teachers make their own translations of policy and that, in general, the profession is riddled by vagueness and conflict.

Control Norms Are Necessary

Daily teachers make an assault on gaining some sense of direction, control and movement of their classes. Teachers work hard to develop a set of norms and rules that both they and their students can live with. This happens as teachers move through a cycle of giving orders, threatening, being tested and finally reaching some standards that are accepted and move the class along. While this is being carried out in individual classrooms, schoolwide norms are also being tried and established. The setting of control norms is a necessary part of teaching; it satisfies the need for certainty in an otherwise ambiguous and uncertain world. It also assures teachers of their place in the organization of the school. No matter how effective teachers are in the classroom, all that is ever really known about them in the general organization of the school is whether they keep their classes in line or whether the students are in control. Control precedes instruction; this is a major shibboleth of teaching.

Professional Support Is Lacking

Seymour Sarason has written that 'teaching is a lonely profession' (Sarason *et al.*, 1966), a characterization that is indeed apt. Unlike other professions, teaching does not provide for a shared culture based on the movement from knowledge to experience in the company of one's peers. Doctors, for instance, learn their profession through a graduated set of experiences, all shared with others. Not so the teacher. Once graduated from a preparation program, teachers find themselves alone in the classroom with a group of students without a peer or supervisor in sight. The neophyte teacher is left with degree in hand, high expectations internalized, a fistful of untried methodologies and few adults with whom to share, grow and learn.

Teaching Is an Art

Teaching is an art, despite current efforts to scientize it. Some parts of teaching may lend themselves to programming and rationalization, but in the long haul more artistry than

science or technology is practised as teachers struggle to adjust and readjust, to make routines and establish patterns, only to recast what has been done in a new form to meet a new need or a new vision. Teachers are best viewed as craftspeople; the reality of teaching is of a craft learned on the job. This understanding is perhaps our most important; that is why we saved it for last. When viewed as a craft, teaching makes sense as a messy and highly personal enterprise, for it concerns itself with the making and remaking of an object until it satisfies the standards of its creator.

In codifying what we have called the 'social system understandings' of teaching, we have attempted to impose some order on what is admittedly a disorderly landscape. As we do this, we are well aware that generalizations — no matter how grounded in the realities of practice — somehow always 'miss the mark'. While useful as guidelines for discussion about our craft, they fail to capture the flesh and blood of teaching, to call up its dailiness. In the section that follows we try to capture some of that dailiness as it is experienced by public school teachers and to build on some of the understandings we have presented here.

The Dailiness of Teaching

In this section we move from understandings to themes. Specifically, we explore notions of *rhythms, rules, interactions* and *feelings* as they are played out in the day-to-day work of teachers in public schools.

Rhythms

A teacher's professional life is measured in terms of years of service. Each of those years is cyclical, mediated by the rhythms of days, of weeks, of months and of seasons. Teachers' days begin early, before the din of the rush hour has peaked, often before the sun has risen. Once sign-in procedures are completed, greetings exchanged with colleagues, the last sip of coffee downed in the teachers' room and the warning bell sounded, the classroom becomes a teacher's total world. It is a world that is unique and separate from the world of other adults. For six hours a day, five days a week, teachers live in an exclusive and totally controlled environment. For the majority of the day they are bound in space and time. In most instances teachers need the permission of the principal to leave the building during school hours. 'Whoever heard of a profession where you can't even go to the bathroom when you have to?'

Each day has its rhythm. For elementary teachers the lunch hour divides the day into morning and afternoon activities, each marked by a recess and perhaps some instructional time with an itinerant teacher. They may spend an entire day in one classroom with one group of students. They create routines and patterns that give the day form and meaning. 'I live in my own little world in my classroom. Sometimes I think that my children and I share a secret life that is off limits to anyone else. We just go about our business, like so many peas in a pod.' For secondary teachers the daily rhythm is more externally determined. Bells ring to signal the passing of classes, each of which will spend some parcel of time with the teacher in his or her classroom. Though students may move throughout

the building, high school teachers often never leave their rooms in the course of a day. For every 'period' or 'hour' there is a routine: taking attendance, continuing from yesterday, introducing today's material, winding down and making an assignment for tomorrow. Repeated five times a day, such routines become fixed and life becomes predictable.

In the course of a day, activities and interactions multiply, energy fluctuates. Elementary teachers may organize activities to accommodate the ebb and flow of the students' and their own energies. There are quiet times and active times, time set aside for individual attention, large-group instruction, small-group work and seatwork. Secondary teachers may acknowledge that they are less effective during the first and last hours and more energetic during the middle of the day. The pace and depth of instruction are altered accordingly. For both elementary and secondary teachers the school day is punctuated by interruptions: PA announcements, telephone calls and messages from the office, minor crises that need attending. All these become incorporated into the pattern of the day. Without missing a step experienced teachers pick up where they left off.

Days merge into weeks. Monday is always difficult. So is Friday, but the difficulties are softened by the promise of the weekend. Midweek is optimal for teaching. The process — review, teach, test — fits neatly into the natural pace of weeks. Weeks become months and months become seasons. Each has its rhythms. Fall is the time of promise; new beginnings always bring hope. As the seasons progress, there is a downward spiral of energy until Thanksgiving, a perfectly timed and well deserved break from the routine. There is a resurgence of sorts between Thanksgiving and Christmas, the most harried three weeks on any calendar. The Christmas break brings relief and buoys teachers and students for the onslaught of the semester's end. January is brief. February is not; it is by far the longest month by any emotional measure. 'I always think of changing professions in February.' By March the end is within sight and energies surge until the spring break, anticipated as much as the Christmas holiday and well appreciated. Then time passes quickly. There is the last-minute rush to get everything in and to meet the promises made in September by early June. The final weeks are filled with activities — final testing and grading, promotions, graduation, end-of-the-year events. Then, quite arbitrarily, on a Friday in June it all stops. Teachers and students go their separate ways. For ten weeks there are no routines, no shared rituals, no school. The patterns that were learned and shared rudely come to an end, to be recreated in the fall when the cycle begins again. Such are the rhythms of teaching.

Rules

Like any profession, teaching has its rules — some codified and formal, others tacitly accepted and informal 'rules of thumb'. Two such rules may be simply stated: *be practical; be private*. Some further elaboration aids us in understanding the effect of these simple rules of behavior for teachers.

After years of formal academic preparation, most teachers enter teaching and experience a common jolt. Equipped with theoretical understandings, they lack the practical knowledge that they need for survival. 'Education courses in and of themselves are quite theoretical. To be sure, they are helpful as far as background material goes, but

there is no substitute for actual *practical* experience . . . . My three year stint of duty as a housemaster and teacher . . . gave me a great deal of *practical* experience in learning more about young people and how to handle young people' (Lortie, 1965). Practical knowledge in schools is defined in terms of its opposites. Being practical is the opposite of being theoretical; being practical is the opposite of being idealistic. University professors are theoretical; inexperienced teachers are idealistic. New teachers in search of practical knowledge, then, must reject the university professors who trained them as well as their own tendencies to seek ideal solutions to difficult problems. Practical knowledge is lodged in the experiences and practices of teachers at work in their classrooms. It is to other teachers and to oneself that the novice must turn for practical ideas.

What makes an idea practical? First, it develops from the circumstance of the school. Second, it has immediate application. Third, it is offered by practical people. Finally, it addresses practical problems. Practical people are those who are or have recently been teachers. Practical school problems include discipline, attendance, order, achievement. Practical ideas require little additional work or preparation; they fit into the existing rhythms of the school. Practical ideas are immediate and concrete and can be effected with the resources and structures that currently exist. 'No teacher ever does what he or she thinks is best. We do the best we can in the circumstances. What you think is a good idea from the outside turns out to be impossible in the classroom.' To be practical means to concentrate on products and processes; to draw on experience rather than research; to be short-range and not predictive in thinking or planning.

As an opposite to idealism, practicality values adjustment, accommodation and adaptation. Idealism is identified with youth; it does not wear well in the adult 'real world' of teaching. New teachers are initiated into the practicality ethic during their first year on the job. They learn their 'place' in the school organization, to keep quiet when private principles are violated by public practices, and to be politic about what they say and to whom they say it. To be practical, in this sense, is to accept the school as it is and to adapt. Striving to change the system is idealistic; striving to make do is practical. Concern for each student's well-being and optimal learning is idealistic; acceptance of limitations of student potential and teacher influence is practical. Reflective self-criticism is idealistic; expressing the belief 'I do the best I can; it's just that the kids don't try' is practical. Being open to change and to outside influences is idealistic; being self-sufficient is practical. Being practical saves one from shame and doubt. It is a useful rule to follow.

The practicality rule has a corollary; that is, be private. In effect, it is practical to be private. What does being private mean? It means not sharing experiences about teaching, about classes, about students, about perceptions. 'I don't know what it's like in business or industry. It may be the same. I don't know how friendly co-workers are, how honest they are. It just seems that in teaching, teachers really are unwilling to be honest with each other, I think, to confide with each other about professional things and personal things.' By following the privacy rule teachers forfeit the opportunity to display their successes; but they also gain. They gain the security of not having to face their failures publicly and losing face.

Being private also means staking out a territory and making it one's own. For most teachers that territory is the individual classroom. 'Teachers have a sense of ''territoriality'' and an ''ideology'' [which] includes a belief of the inviolability of a teacher's classroom'

(McPherson, 1972). To ensure their claim, teachers seldom invite each other into their classes. Observation is equated with evaluation, and evaluation violates one's sense of place and position in the world.

In being private, each teacher makes an individual and conscious choice to go it alone. 'Me? You get to a point. I made a personal decision. I know a lot of teachers have done the same thing. You seal off the room and you deal with the students. You say, "you and me and let's see what we can do alone".' Most schools do not provide meaningful supervision, and most teachers do not ask for it. The very act of teaching is invisible to one's peers. 'It is safer to be private. There is some safety in the tradition, even though it keeps you lonely.' Loneliness and isolation are high prices to pay, but teachers willingly pay them when the alternatives are seen as exposure and censure. When asked in whom he confides about his days, one man replied with some sense of irony and sadness, 'My wife.'

Interactions

Given the power of classroom territoriality, it comes as no surprise that the most important and immediate interactions that teachers have are with their students. 'You work with kids. That's what you do. And a school is a place that will allow you to do that.' Since, as noted earlier, almost all rewards come from students, relationships with them are primary in the constellation of interactions in a school. For elementary teachers, the focus on children is a taken-for-granted phenomenon. 'I'm with my children all day long. I watch them change by the moment. Some days they'll tell me all of their secrets. Other days, they withdraw into their own little shells. Whatever they do, I'm there to see and hear it, and I take it all to heart.' For secondary teachers relationships with students are more fragmented and are mediated through the subject matter. 'It is the subject matter and the kids. I love the subject matter and naturally you need an audience for that. The kids are the audience and they're important to me. I can't teach my subject matter without touching the kids in some way.' In either case, relationships with students are daily, direct, sometimes conflictual, but always central. 'I dream about them. I have nightmares about them. I can't lose them. It is worse on vacation. When I'm in school and it's late October and I've accepted that I'm really back, then the dreams finally stop.'

For most it is the personal interaction rather than instructional interaction that is most valued. This is true on the secondary as well as on the elementary level. 'If someone told me that my job is just to teach math, I would quit. I couldn't stand to see myself as someone who teaches skills and nothing else. I have to feel that I am doing something more lasting.' What is that 'something more lasting'? It has to do with influencing and guiding children toward adulthood, with serving as a moral presence, with having a stake in the future. 'When you realize that what you say in the classroom — even though you think no one is listening — has an effect on your students, you realize that you are a role model, even if you don't see yourself that way. The kids take what I have to say, think about it, and made decisions based on it. I have that kind of influence . . . it's scary but it makes me feel good. It's a big responsibility.' Such involvement has its rewards both in the present and in the future. 'I like to see them when they come back, so I can see how they're doing, how they're turning out. I love to watch them grow. It's terrific. It's true

with any age group — you can see the growth and development. Let's hope it continues. They're so cute. They are all individuals and they bubble about certain things. Some of them, my God, are so brave . . .'

We cannot overstate the importance of teacher-student interactions. When the rewards from these interactions are plentiful, teachers are energized and thrive. When the rewards from these interactions are diminished, teachers lose that part of themselves that is most self-sustaining and most central to the well-being of the profession.

If teaching is to be understood as a 'lonely profession', then the source of that loneliness lies outside the realm of children. It is posited in the realm of interactions with other adults, especially one's peers. While relations with students tend to be immediate, direct and engaging, relations with peers may be characterized as remote, oblique and defensively protective. The rule of privacy governs peer interactions in a school. It is all right to talk about the news, the weather, sports and sex. It is all right to complain in general about the school and the students. However, it is not acceptable to discuss instruction and what happens in classrooms as colleagues.

> If I were to go into the lounge and say, 'I've had a great class. The kids are really interesting. They were on the board, asking great questions, and they really got from me what I wanted them to,' no one would respond.
>
> I have never heard another teacher say, 'I have a problem.' You just don't do it. You solve the problem on your own, or you pretend that you don't have one. You never open up to anyone about anything important.

For most teachers in most schools, teaching is indeed a lonely enterprise. With so many people engaged in so common a mission in so compact a space and time, it is perhaps the greatest irony — and the greatest tragedy of teaching — that so much is carried on in self-imposed and professionally sanctioned isolation.

Our discussion of interactions is not complete until we consider the relation between teachers and principal in a building. Although face-to-face interactions with the principal may not be common, especially in a large urban high school, the relationship with one's principal is of paramount importance in a teacher's work life. A principal sets a tone. 'I think a principal can make or break a school in terms of — not even the day-to-day functioning — but in terms of the umbrella of attitudes and emotions.' That umbrella covers a wide area. The principal has the power to make working in a school pleasant or unbearable; that is quite a bit of power. A principal who makes teaching pleasant is one who trusts the staff to perform classroom duties with competence, and who deals with parents and the community in a way that supports teachers' decisions and safeguards against personal attacks.

Teachers avoid 'getting on the bad side' of a principal; such a position makes life unbearable. The principal has the power to make extra duty assignments, to criticize classroom practices, to assign undesirable class schedules. More importantly, on an informal level being disliked by the principal carries with it distinct psychological disadvantages. 'If I see him in the hall and he doesn't smile or look at me, I'm upset all day. What did I do wrong? Why doesn't he like me? Will he listen to me if there's a problem? I know it shouldn't affect me, but it does.' When teachers view a principal as critical or

punishing, they are less likely to take risks and try new approaches. When teachers view a principal as supporting and rewarding, they are more able to approach the principal for support in trying something new, in securing resources, in gaining permission for special undertakings.

The relationship of teacher to principal is one of gaining access to privilege, and almost all privileges are arbitrarily in the hands of the principal. This is especially true for teachers who themselves aspire to administrative positions. The principal's recommendation about the administrative potential of teachers is taken seriously. While many teachers profess that they avoid the principal and learn to work around him or her, the importance of that office is always felt in the daily life of the school.

Feelings

Strong feelings accompany intense and varied interactions. The feelings of teachers about their work and their lives are complex, characterized by conflict, frustration, satisfaction and joy.

When we characterized teacher-student interactions as the major source of rewards for teachers, we placed great emphasis on feelings of genuine satisfaction that accrue from these relationships. The other side of those feelings, of living one's professional life always in the company of children, is also quite powerful for teachers. These other feelings are more negative and often come to light in the company of other adults who work in 'the real world', not the world of schools.

> I had a disagreement with my mother-in-law the other day. I don't remember what it was about — taxes or something that is being voted on. Every time I started to talk, she would disagree and then tell me that I didn't live in the real world, that I spent all of my time with kids, and that I just didn't know about business and other things. I felt very angry. That kind of thing happens now and again. I feel that I do live in the real world, but people who don't teach don't think that's true.

To the rest of the world teachers often seem to be living in a child's reality and are viewed as not being able to function as adults in an adult world. This perception leaves teachers uneasy at best, defensive at worse, almost always self-doubting and characteristically ambivalent about their roles and their constant relationship with young people.

Feelings of self-doubt are exacerbated by the absence of a standard by which one can measure one's professional competence. The lack of peer support and interaction makes it difficult to develop a clear sense of the quality of one's own teaching. Teaching skills are evaluated by the students, whose judgment is not always trustworthy, and by oneself. 'It took me ten years to feel that I was a good teacher. In fact, I would try very hard not to miss a day of school. I thought if a substitute came in and taught my classes that all the students would find out how bad I was and how good someone else was.' There is a general lack of confidence, a pervasive feeling of vulnerability, a fear of being 'found out'. Such feelings are made worse because of the privacy ethic. There is no safe place to air one's

167

uncertainties and to get the kind of feedback necessary to reduce the anxiety about being a good teacher, or at least an adequate one.

One way a teacher may gain some confidence is to define a sphere of control. For most that is the classroom. It becomes essential to gain and maintain dominance if one is to survive. 'When I'm in my classroom, I know I'm in control. I can teach the way I want to teach, do what I want to do.' Once inside the classroom, a teacher knows that all control is tenuous. It depends on a negotiated agreement between students and the teacher. If that agreement is violated, a teacher will subordinate all teaching activities to one primary goal: to regain and maintain control. Keeping a class in order is the only visible indication to one's colleagues and principal that one is, in fact, a good teacher. When one loses control, one loses everything.

Feelings about control are made more problematic by the awareness on the part of teachers that once outside the classroom, their control is severely limited. Within the formal organization of the school, teachers have little authority in making decisions that affect their environment. Teachers, then, move from a level of almost complete authority to a level of powerlessness. This being in-and-out-of-control leads to feelings of frustration and resignation to the ways things are and will always be.

The feelings that surround issues of always being with children, of professional competence and of being in-and-out-of-control are highly charged and little acknowledged. They should not be underestimated; these feelings often block a teacher's impulse to work to improve one's teaching or to influence what happens in the school.

Rhythms, Rules, Interactions and Feelings

In this section we have tried to present a view of some of the day-to-day realities of schools for the teachers who work there. We have concentrated on rhythms, rules, interactions and feelings as a way to gain some insight into schools and how to make them better. We may summarize by saying:

> By understanding rhythms, we come to realize that years are cyclical; that time in schools is finite; that patterns often supplant purpose; that what has been done may be undone in the seasons that follow; and that what has not yet been done is still in the realm of the possible.
>
> By understanding rules, we come to accept the limits of rational plans, the inevitability of resistance, the power of collective sanctions and the inviolability of individuals and their classrooms.
>
> By understanding interactions, we come to an awareness of the centrality of children in teachers' lives, of the unrealized potential of colleagueship and of the power of a principal to make a school better or worse.
>
> By understanding feelings, we appreciate ambiguity, vulnerability and defensiveness as camouflages for commitment, concern and hope; and we come to value patience and realism as guideposts for our own actions.

References

BENTZEN, M. (1975) *Changing the Magic Feather Principle*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

DOYLE, W. and PONDER, G. A. (1977–78) 'The Practicality Ethic in Teacher Decision Making,' *Interchange*, 8(3) pp. 1–12.

EMRICK, J. and PETERSON, S. (1978) *A Synthesis of Findings: Five Recent Studies of Educational Dissemination and Change*. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratories.

GEOFFREY, W. (1968) *Complexities of an Urban Classroom*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

GOODLAD, J. I. (1975) *The Dynamics of Educational Change*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

GROSS, N., GIACQUINTA, J. B. and BERNSTEIN, M. (1971) *Implementing Organizational Innovations*. New York: Basic Books.

JACKSON, P. (1968) *Life in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

LORTIE, D. C. (1965) 'Teacher Socialization: The Robinson Crusoe Model,' in *The Real World of the Classroom Teacher*, Report of the 1965 National TEPS Conference. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

MCPHERSON, G. (1972) *Small Town Teacher*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

SARASON, S. B., LEVINE, M., GOLDENBERG, I., CHERLIN, D. and BENNETT, E. (1966) *Psychology in Community Settings*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

SHIMAN, D. A. and LIEBERMAN, A. (1974) 'Non-Model for Schools,' *Educational Forum*, 38(4), pp. 441–5

SMITH, L. and KEITH, P. (1971) *Anatomy of an Educational Innovation*. New York: Wiley.

SUSSMAN, L. (1977) *Tales Out of School: Implementing Organizational Change in the Elementary Grades*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

WALLER, W. (1967) *The Sociology of Teaching*. New York: John Wiley.

1654

Chapter 9

Teachers as Colleagues*

Judith Warren Little

Research has yielded rich, detailed descriptions of the work of teachers. These descriptions present two quite different portraits of teachers' professional lives. In large numbers of schools, and for long periods of time, teachers are colleagues in name only. They work out of sight and hearing of one another, plan and prepare their lessons and materials alone, and struggle on their own to solve most of their instructional, curricular and management problems. Against this almost uniform backdrop of isolated work, some schools stand out for the professional relations they foster among teachers. These schools, more than others, are organized to permit the sort of 'reflection in action' that Sykes (1983a, p. 90) argues has been largely absent from professional preparation and professional work in schools. For teachers in such schools, work involves colleagueship of a more substantial sort. Recognition and satisfaction stem not only from being a masterful teacher but also from being a member of a masterful group.

This chapter examines the possibilities and limits of collegiality among teachers. In framing a view of collegiality, I have relied primarily on three groups of studies. Studies of the professional 'workplace' character of successful schools have drawn attention to collegial relations among teachers and to the ability of administrators or teacher leaders to foster those relations. Studies of organized teacher teaming have underscored some of the benefits of teacher collaboration but have also raised questions about the stability and continuity of work groups in schools. The teaming studies help to place face-to-face cooperative work amid a wider spectrum of joint action by teachers. Finally, studies of school improvement, teacher preparation, professional development and the implementation of innovations have all identified certain inescapable and consequential relations among teachers and between teachers and administrators that spell the difference between success and disappointment.

The accumulated research has made obvious the contrast between the conditions of professional work that prevail in most schools and the conditions that have been achieved

*This chapter was published originally in V. Richardson-Koehler (ed.), *Educators' Handbook: A Research Perspective* (New York: Longman, 1987), pp. 491–518. The author is indebted to Tom Bird for his part in formulating many of the ideas reflected in this chapter and to Patrick Shields for his assistance in reviewing the literature.

in a much smaller number of schools or districts. Side by side with a devastating picture of professional isolation among experienced teachers and trial-and-error survival of beginning teachers are descriptions of institutions that have organized to promote professional collaboration and to give assistance to those just learning to teach.

These latter schools, in which collegial relations prevail, are urban and rural, large and small. They are more often elementary and middle-level schools than they are high schools (Cusick, 1980), but not exclusively so (Bird and Little, 1985). In them ordinary people, relying on ordinary budgets and confronted with the ordinary ebb and flow of energy, goodwill and creativity, accomplish extraordinary things. As a basis for action, the differences in sheer numbers between the many isolating schools and the rare collegial schools are of less moment than the differences in their organizational character.

This is a literature of school life. Granted that there are larger phenomena at stake, requiring a broader sweep, it remains true that the educational goals we hold for our children and our communities are achieved, or are compromised, one school at a time. Taken together, recent studies have generated an increasingly sophisticated grasp of the professional structure of teaching in schools. The discoveries of the 1970s and 1980s make our understanding of collegiality less crude, our enthusiasms more carefully tempered.

Finally, this literature is theoretically, methodologically and practically rich. It promises a conceptualization of conditions in schools that plausibly support learning to teach and the steady improvement of teaching over time. It draws on the perspectives and methods of several academic disciplines. Its questions, methods and findings engage the intellectual curiosities, day-to-day experiences and professional aspirations of teachers and others with whom they work.

What Difference Do Colleagues Make?

The reason to pursue the study and practice of collegiality is that, presumably, something is gained when teachers work together and something is lost when they do not. The teachers who put aside other activities in order to work with colleagues, the principals who promote and organize such work, the superintendents who endorse it, and the school boards that pay for it must all be convinced that the benefits are substantial; in effect, the perceived benefits must be great enough that the time teachers spend together can compete with time spent in other ways, on other priorities that are equally compelling or more immediate.

Teachers' professional encounters with one another assume greater importance when placed against future demands on schools and on the teaching profession. At stake is a profession that attracts able and talented candidates by affording them work that is intellectually stimulating, personally meaningful, economically rewarding and well regarded in the larger community (Lyons and McCleary, 1980; Sykes, 1983a). Equally at stake is an image of schools organized to improve steadily (or to adapt rapidly) by tapping the collective talents, experience and energy of their professional staffs (Bird and Little, 1986; Little 1985; Glickman, 1985; Lieberman and Miller, 1984).

Emerging visions of the teaching profession and of the school as a professional environment are in tension with inherited traditions. On the whole, tenacious habits of

mind and deed make the achievement of strong collegial relations a remarkable accomplishment: not the rule, but the rare, often fragile exception.

Do Students Benefit When Teachers Work Together?

The teacher-student relationship is both the major *obligation* to which teachers are held and the primary source of *rewards* in teaching (Ashton, Webb and Doda, 1982; Mitchell, Ortiz and Mitchell, 1983; Lortie, 1975). The relations that teachers establish with fellow teachers or with other adults will — and must — be judged by their ability to make teachers' relations with students more productive and more satisfying.

Some studies offer vivid accounts of the classroom payoffs that follow teachers' joint efforts. Teachers who have worked together closely over a period of years celebrate their accomplishments by pointing to gains in the achievement, behavior and attitude of students. In one study of six urban schools, teachers in an elementary school atrributed schoolwide academic gains and improvements in classroom performance to the fact that they had worked in grade-level teams once a week for two years to tie their curriculum and instruction to principles of mastery learning (Little 1981). Teachers in a junior high school traced both their remarkable gains in math achievement and the virtual elimination of classroom behavior problems to the revisions in curriculum, testing and student placement procedures they had achieved working as a group (Bird and Little, 1985). In the eyes of these teachers, the benefits of working together have outweighed the advantages of working alone. The quality of program in which students participate, the sense of program coherence and faculty cohesiveness that students detect, and the consistency in expectations that students encounter all figure prominently in teachers' descriptions (see also Rutter, *et al.*, 1979).

By other accounts, however, the classroom benefits of shared work are not so readily apparent. Fledgling team efforts founder when participants find them too thin a resource for meeting the daily pressures of the classroom. Observing the apparent instability of teaming efforts in sixteen elementary schools, Bredo (1977) speculates that the 'immediacy' of classroom tasks places a premium on rapid decision-making, close coordination of activities and basic agreements about standards and procedures. Unaccustomed to planning curriculum together or to arriving at collective agreements about instruction or management, teachers often find their first efforts clumsy and unrewarding. The time spent in meetings appears to be time lost in meeting the requirements of lesson planning and instruction. Predictably, 'unproductive' meetings are abandoned in favor of more familiar and satisfying routines. In one elementary school only teachers' commitment to try a pilot program for a full two-year term saw them through the first six months of learning to work productively together (Little, 1981).

Skeptics doubt the benefits of teacher collaboration. Some protest that extensive out-of-classroom time is suspect. Others maintain that the press for cooperation may lead individual teachers to succumb to peer pressure, leading to compliant implementation of ideas with little merit or to robotlike activity that stifles variety.

The influences that shape students' learning, attitudes and actions are interwoven and cumulative. Productive peer relations among teachers, where they exist, are difficult to

174

disentangle from the many other contributors to the classroom environment and student success. The composition and character of a class, the quality of a teacher's moment-by-moment decision-making in the classroom, the latitude for teachers to make curricular and instructional choices, the school's allocation of time and other resources for joint work, and the stability of the general environment all enter into the equation.

We know relatively little about the specific mechanisms by which collegial relations among teachers operate to the benefit of students. Is it that lesson planning improves as people press each other to say not only what they do with students, but why? Is it that the toughest, most persistent problems of curriculum, instruction and classroom management get the benefit of the group's experience? Is it the combined sense of confidence and obligation that teachers carry into the classroom? Is it the peer pressure to live up to agreements made and ideas offered? Is it that in making teaching principles and practices more public, the best practices are promoted more widely and the weakest ones are abandoned? Is it simply that close work with colleagues affords a kind of stimulation and solidarity that reflects itself in energetic classroom performance and holds talented teachers longer in the profession? Are the rate and quality of classroom innovation higher? Or does the sheer visibility of teachers at work with one another, or closely in touch with one another throughout the day or week, deliver its own message to students?

In the eyes of enthusiasts, the answer lies in some complex and elusive combination of all these possibilities. Each of these and several more possible interpretations are threaded throughout the available literature. They read as plausible explanations for the way collegial influences might operate, but they have not yet been subject to systematic inquiry.

What Do Veteran Teachers Gain from Close Colleagues?

The advantages of collegial work, as experienced teachers describe them, center on one theme: breaking the isolation of the classroom. Over time teachers who work closely together on matters of curriculum and instruction find themselves better equipped for classroom work. They are frequently and credibly recognized for their professional capabilities and interests; and they take pride in professional relationships that withstand differences in viewpoint and occasional conflict.

Instructional Range, Depth and Flexibility

The relationship between teacher collaboration and instructional quality has been examined in series of studies by Elizabeth Cohen (1981) and her associates at Stanford. In early stages of the work they found significant correlations between teaming arrangements and teachers' capacity to accommodate new curriculum. Cooperation served teachers well as they worked to understand and apply new ideas, methods and materials. In subsequent phases of work the Stanford group posed this question: do teaming arrangements in turn expand schools' and teachers' ability to achieve even greater complexity? Questionnaire data from teachers in sixteen elementary schools produced mixed results. Members of teams begun in 1973 did not report appreciably greater variation in classroom materials by

1975, leading the research group to doubt whether team structures operate to enrich an instructional or curricular repertoire. Yet there was some evidence that teaming did enhance reflective decision-making in the classroom. In one substudy, Intili (1977) found strong relationships between all her measures of reflective decision-making by teachers and their participation in a cooperative group that met often and worked together intensively (see also Cohen *et al.*, 1979; Bredo, 1975).

This is fundamentally a question of what teachers can and do achieve by working together. Is collaborative work productive mainly for responding to shifts in external circumstances? For organizing to understand and apply ideas developed by others, or to regroup when the community population or preferences shift? Or is a team-based organization a resource for development? Preliminary assessments of what a team can accomplish were based on a readily measurable but narrow definition of 'greater complexity', that is, variation in instructional materials. The Stanford studies examined how teams accommodated the demands of new curriculum, requiring new methods and materials in the classroom; the very circumstances may thus have acted to limit the volume of instructional variation among the team members, making it appear that the team structure served only to manage existing requirements but did little to foster new alternatives.

Recent studies have enlarged our view of the complex tasks that draw teachers into work together and of the range of benefits that their work may yield. The complexities introduced by a new curriculum create one compelling reason for teachers to work together; an even more complex challenge, it appears, is to examine and refine the existing curriculum and instruction of a group and to select and implement improvements on a continual basis.

In schools where teams have seen it as their obligation to propose new ideas and methods or to continue the development of a curriculum over time, there is persuasive evidence that complex variations in materials, instruction and classroom-based social organization have developed as a consequence of joint effort (Bird and Little, 1985). In one junior high school two of the four 'core' academic departments worked together closely over five years with the explicit aims of improving students' academic achievement and enriching the learning environment of classrooms. Originally convened by the principal as a study group, the teachers' task was to examine their present practices in the light of available classroom research and to develop alternatives consistent with the principles they discovered. Over time they revised their own approach to curriculum development, lesson planning, testing and student placement. They expanded their instructional repertoire by relying less on whole-group direct instruction and by introducing selective use of cooperative or student team learning.

In the two 'active' departments teachers argued that their collaboration produced an expanded pool of ideas, materials and methods and a collective ability to generate higher-quality solutions to problems. The evolving coherence and vitality in the curriculum, the rate of instructional innovation, the frequency and depth of discussion about instructional and classroom management issues and the demonstrated academic, social and affective gains among the students all far outstripped the two other academic departments in the same school whose members lacked the same shared purposes and engaged in far less collective action. The habits and structures of group work have enabled teachers to

attempt innovations in curriculum and instruction that they could not have implemented as individuals, for example, a full-scale field experiment to test curriculum alternatives in social studies.

In sum, the early Stanford studies credited team work with easing the burden of new external demands but left it uncertain that teachers who work together will achieve a level of instructional sophistication that they would not ordinarily reach by working alone. Subsequent in-depth case studies have confirmed the finding that team structure alone is insufficient to advance instructional practice; crucially, however, they have also expanded our view of the potential consequences that may flow from joint action and have underscored the importance of a group's perceived purposes and obligations in shaping its tasks and probable outcomes (Little and Bird, 1984a). The conclusions that one draws from the experiences of closely orchestrated, task-oriented groups in schools are consistent with conclusions drawn from other studies of organizations: the accomplishments of a proficient and well organized group are widely considered to be greater than the accomplishments of isolated individuals (Blau and Scott, 1962).

Influence and Respect

The more 'public' an enterprise teaching becomes, the more it both requires and supports collective scrutiny. Among the most public environments for teaching has been the open-space school, and it is from studies of open-space schools that many of the insights about teacher-to-teacher interaction and influence have been drawn. Meyer and his colleagues at Stanford found that teachers in open-space schools exerted more influence on others and accorded their colleagues more influence on their own teaching than did teachers in conventional settings (Meyer *et al.*, 1971; Bredo, 1977). Teachers in open-space schools were more likely to believe that their peers' evaluations of them were important and were well founded (Marram, Dornbush and Scott, 1972).

In open-space schools teaching is made public by circumstance. Sheer visibility creates a degree of mutual dependence and influence not required by more conventional single-classroom arrangements. But visibility has its limits. Even (or especially) in open environments, teachers inevitably concentrate their attention and energy close at hand, on their own students. Even in open-space environments, something more is needed to convert mere attentiveness to a systematic, reciprocal influence on the conceptions and practices of teaching. The highest levels of reciprocal influence reported by teachers were reserved for schools in which teachers were both routinely visible to one another (i.e., open-space) and were routinely and intensively involved in teams; in these settings teachers' knowledge about and reliance upon one another were most essential (Meyer *et al.*, 1971). The greater the opportunities for involvement (e.g., the more 'balanced' the participation in group meetings), the greater the influence felt by the participating individuals and the higher their satisfaction with the team (Molnar, 1971). Summing up these findings, Cohen (1981) observes: 'Two very different kinds of team interaction are taking place in these . . . schools; one produces many influential teachers and the other produces few'. (p. 182).

A combination of visibility (teaching planned for and done in the presence of others), shared responsibility and widespread interaction heightens the influence of teachers on one

another and on the school as a whole. In the 1970s the open-space movement promoted precisely that combination. In the 1980s, when open-space schools have diminished in popularity, it is a combination harder to find. The developing enthusiasm for peer observation and peer 'coaching' provides one surrogate for day-by-day visibility; what peer observation cannot achieve in daily contact it gains in concentration (Showers, 1985).

This is a scenario in which both teachers and principals stand to gain. Joint work offers a form of professional autonomy that is not protection from scrutiny or freedom from external demand but is instead heightened control over work that resides in the group. Based on an investigation of teachers' and principals' influence over decisions relating to pupil management, curriculum, teaching methods and other aspects of school and classroom life, Johnson (1976) developed a typology of extensive and intensive collaboration. In the schools with the highest levels of extensive collaboration (many people) and intensive collaboration (frequent interaction on key decisions), both principals and teachers felt more influential than either group felt in less interactive settings (see also Barnett, 1982).

Career Rewards and Daily Satisfactions

Through work with others teachers shape their perspectives on their daily work and revise or confirm their assessments of their career choices. Teachers in schools known for high rates of innovation and team work distinguish carefully between end-of-year weariness and career burnout. Some teachers say they require periods of 'on-the-job sabbatical' to slow the pace of constant innovation, to consolidate gains and to ensure that multiple innovations form an integrated whole in the classroom. Their enthusiasm for teaching, however, has been sustained in large part by collective efforts to learn and apply new ideas (Little, 1981; Bird and Little, 1985).

Working together to understand and improve life in the classroom, teachers reduce the 'endemic uncertainties' (Lortie, 1975, p. 134) that ordinarily make a teacher's hold on success so tenous. Instead of grasping for the single dramatic event or the special achievements of a few children as the main source of pride, teachers are more able to detect and celebrate a pattern of accomplishments within and across classrooms.

Virtually no research has been conducted on the long-term effects of teacher collaboration on career commitment or orientation. In an occupational and organizational culture that makes intensive collaboration hard to find, teachers who value shared work may find themselves less rather than more satisfied in teaching, ready to leave rather than stay. In the short run professional recognition, professional involvement and professional influence prove to be powerful substitutes for less accessible rewards (see Ashton *et al.*, 1982).

Do Beginning Teachers Benefit from Close Colleagues?

Virtually all teachers in American schools assume full responsibility for student learning and for the independent management of a classroom from their first day on the job. Unlike the more gradual, incremental introduction that newcomers receive to other occupations,

entry into teaching has been labeled 'abrupt', 'unmediated' and 'unstaged' (Lortie, 1975; Nemser, 1983). Asked how they have learned to teach, teachers over and over report that they have learned 'on my own', 'by trial and error' or 'it was sink or swim' (Ryan, 1970; Little, 1981; Fuchs, 1969). A prevailing belief that teaching is learned by independent trial and error is reflected in (and sustained by) norms that constrain the interaction between experienced and novice teachers and by the relative scarcity of organizational arrangements for assistance and support by universities, districts or schools (Doyle and Nespor, 1984).

Critics of this short, survival-oriented induction period argue that it serves neither teachers nor students well. Mutual assistance, they propose, would make new recruits less isolated, more self-confident, more proficient in the classroom — and more inclined to continue in teaching past the first one or two years (Copeland and Jamgochian, 1985). By this view a first-year teacher might properly be described as a 'well-started novice' (Clark, 1984) for whom the subtleties and complexities of masterful teaching are introduced gradually.

A distinction is in order between the social support that puts newcomers at ease and the professional support that advances one's knowledge and practice of teaching. Many beginning teachers are indeed made welcome in their first assignments. Experienced teachers take newcomers 'under their wing' and show them around the building, introduce them to faculty members and other staff, show them where to locate books and supplies, and offer to be available for help: 'If you need anything, just ask.' Other first-year teachers are not so fortunate, of course, and remain as socially isolated as they are professionally unsupported. In neither case, typically, is a beginning teacher's relationship with other teachers systematically directed toward learning to teach (or learning to teach in this school, in this community, with these students).

Without diminishing the import of moral support and emotional solidarity, the central issue here is one of professional relations that go well beyond the usual 'buddy' arrangement. The classroom successes and failures of novice teachers are little affected by the general friendliness of the staff or by broad school philosophy (Veenman, 1984). Less common — and arguably more critical — are professional encounters that bring experienced teachers and beginning teachers close to the classroom together and that plausibly influence the competence and confidence of the beginning teachers.

Organized assistance may permit beginning teachers to achieve a balance between practical fluency and conceptual understanding, between the press to accumulate the 'tricks of the trade' (Lortie, 1975, p. 77) and the opportunity for slowly evolving understanding of underlying conceptual principles (Nemser, 1983, p. 161). Recent research provides insight into two possibilities. First, research into the character of the mentor-protégé relationship (Gehrke and Kay, 1984) examines the part that senior colleagues play in offering direct assistance to beginning teachers. Second, research on school-level norms of collegiality (Little, 1982) provides a basis for examining the ways in which schools are organized — or not — as environments for learning to teach.

Traditions of Apprenticeship or Mentoring

Meaningful mentoring relations between experienced and beginning teachers are the exception rather than the rule. Such relations are applauded by a few teachers who have

experienced them and are widely considered to be a superior but uncommon arrangement for learning to teach. The admiration that teachers express for the basic concept of mentoring stands in sharp contrast to a fundamental reality in the culture of teaching: teachers learn to teach not only through experience but through solitary experience. In addition, the available evidence on the dynamics and consequences of mentoring and other organized support is meager and uneven. Reviewing the records of supervised internships, McDonald (1980) was unable to detect any differences in the evaluations received by first-year interns and those received by beginning teachers in more conventional arrangements. McDonald's findings serve to curb unwarranted enthusiasm. Nonetheless, they deserve some closer scrutiny. In reading the program reviews one is reminded that we have little data on potentially consequential variations in the scale and intensity of assistance. We still know little about the ability of supervisors to assist first-year teachers or to construct evaluations that well represent their development (but see Wilburn and Drummond, 1984). We apply few methods, either in research or practice, that help us to detect evolving approaches to teacher planning and reflectivity. These developments in the way teachers think about and plan for their work with students may not be highly visible in a beginning teacher's behavior, particularly in the first few months of teaching, when the translation of intent into practice is often unpolished. Recent studies centering on the 'prideful occasion' in learning to teach (Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann, 1985) or on student teachers' reflective examinations of their unsuccessful lessons (Borko *et al.*, 1985) hold promise.

Lortie's analysis of socialization and induction into teaching, published in 1975, still rings true. However, in the dozen or so years since Lortie's landmark work, researchers have chronicled three developments that have prospects for altering professional relationships between the beginning teacher and experienced colleagues.

First, pre-service teacher education programs have been examined for the pattern of beliefs, habits and skills they convey with regard to learning to teach and for their contributions to the socialization of teachers into the beliefs and customs of an occupation (Lacey, 1977; Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986). Some institutions have revised entire curricula to tackle the commonly held perception of teacher education students that they have nothing to learn from their formal preparation programs (Book, Byers and Freeman, 1983). Others have launched programs designed to introduce the perspectives and habits of collegiality by organizing support teams that make prospective teachers mutually responsible for one another's learning (Copeland and Jamgochian, 1985). Still others have acknowledged that encounters between beginning teachers and their assigned supervisors are typically infrequent, unfocused and uncoordinated (Griffin *et al.*, 1983) and have concentrated on strengthening the quality and frequency of assistance from university and school-based supervisors of student teachers (California State University, 1984) or first-year teachers (Wilburn and Drummond, 1984; Tisher, 1980). Schools that are deliberately and thoughtfully organized to accommodate the interests and requirements of student teachers have been described (Lanier, 1983; Weyand, 1983; Bird and Little, 1985).

Second, improvements in teacher evaluation policies and procedures have increasingly been targeted to the first-year teacher (Darling-Hammond, 1984). Based in part on a progressive apprenticeship model, these district evaluation policies have combined frequent observation with consultation and assistance.

Finally, the expanded professional opportunities and rewards that accrue to

exemplary teachers under the terms of various state and local initiatives have routinely been accompanied by new professional obligations. Such initiatives explicitly alter the expected professional relations between experienced teachers and beginning teachers. In a variety of career ladder plans, in the California Mentor Teacher Program and in other master teacher or teacher adviser programs, experienced and highly regarded senior teachers are asked to assume the obligation for assisting new teachers (Schlechty, 1984; Career Ladder Research Group, 1984; Wagner, 1985; Southern Regional Education Board, 1984).

The expanded professional roles introduced by these initiatives and by other incentives programs constitute a radical departure from historical precedent in the teaching occupation. While master or mentor teacher designations give credit to superior knowledge, skill and energy, they also fly in the face of longstanding precedents of 'non-interference' (Pellegrin, 1976). Experienced teachers ordinarily refrain from intervening in the struggles of novice teachers, while those same novices request assistance with specific problems only when certain that their basic competence is not in question (Newberry, 1977). In the absence of formal supervisory authority, even the most accomplished teachers are reluctant to assert their own knowledge and experience with fellow teachers. Among the 180 teachers who responded to Gehrke and Kay's (1984) survey on career issues, almost 60 per cent claimed to have had some kind of 'mentoring' relationship in learning to teach, but only three teachers named a fellow teacher as a mentor (p. 22).

The precedents of non-interference are powerful, and claims to individual autonomy are closely guarded. Even teachers designated as master teachers, mentors or advisers are humble about their expertise and uncertain about how to enter into relations that will be both rigorous and respectful. (Little, Galagaran and O'Neal, 1984; Bird *et al.*, 1984). Teachers who were designated as 'assisters' precisely because of their knowledge and skill still 'struggled with the "collegial/expert" dichotomy' in their relations with teachers (Goodman and Lieberman, 1985, p. 8). Yet teachers accustomed to well supported collaborative work more readily accorded to one another the right to take the lead on issues of curriculum and instruction (Schmuck, Runkel and Langmeyer, 1971). In teacher surveys aimed at uncovering teachers' rights of initiative on matters close to the classroom, teachers routinely approved of greater professional assertion by teachers and administrators than they were accustomed to seeing in practice (Bird and Little, 1985).

The conditions, forms and consequences of mentor-protégé relations in learning to teach deserve closer attention, not only because of the inevitable costs associated with altered induction arrangements but also because the relevant outcomes go well beyond ensuring adequate technical performance in the classroom. The wider set of outcomes includes beginning teachers' sense of personal and institutional efficacy, their capacity to grapple intellectually with crucial substantive problems in education, their inclination to work and learn with colleagues, and their professional commitment to teaching as a career.

Learning to Teach in a 'Collegial School'

As environments for learning to teach, highly 'collegial' schools offer an alternative to the 'sink or swim' image of learning to teach. Nonetheless, 'collegial' schools do not necessarily make hospitable settings for novice teachers. Schools that are well organized to foster (and benefit from) the continued development of experienced, pedagogically

sophisticated teachers are not necessarily well organized to assist beginning teachers. While the two environments are not mutually exclusive, neither are they identical.

A faculty accustomed to team work may nonetheless prove ill equipped to receive novice teachers. Established collegial teams have a standard of productivity, a fast pace, a shared language and an accumulated knowledge base that may prove hard for beginning teachers to assimilate. A student teacher placed in one highly teamed school was impressed by the 'constant exchange of ideas and careful planning for the team's mix of students' but was 'ambivalent about the pressure she feels when the whole team is working together on a unit' (Lipsitz, 1983, pp. 150–1). Teachers working together to improve their work provide a good model of professional relations but create a demanding situation for first- and second-year teachers.

Newcomers to a highly coordinated faculty may unwittingly jeopardize the agreements and achievements of a group. In one recent study experienced middle-school teachers acted in concert on hard-won agreements about curriculum instruction and classroom management but found their agreements difficult to maintain when the rights of eight student teachers to 'experiment' outweighed the rights of the experienced group to state expectations and preferences (Little and Bird, 1984b).

Still, schools with habits of collaboration appear well equipped to adapt quickly and systematically to assist beginning teachers. In the study just described the experienced teachers, accustomed to group problem-solving, met to share their impressions of the student teaching program. The meeting uncovered the frustrations of individuals but also revealed commonalities of circumstance and purpose among the master teachers; it ended with an agreement to 'get organized' with respect to student teaching. Within the first eight weeks of school in the fall, seven master teachers met twice on their own and twice with a university supervisor to arrive at a policy to govern student teaching in the building.

I have concentrated on the significance of collegial support for novice teachers. But veteran teachers also periodically find themselves in unfamiliar and challenging situations that test the limits of their knowledge and experience. The special advantages (and special difficulties) of the mentor-protégé relation and the well established collegial group are no less significant to experienced teachers who, after several years in the classroom, must now tackle new subjects, new grade levels or new instructional methods. Finally, overt guidance (mentoring) and involvement in a support group have been described as crucially important features of programs that prepare skilled teachers to adopt leadership roles in teaching (Kent, 1985; Goodman and Lieberman, 1985).

Benefits to the School

Increasingly, schools must bolster public faith and enlist public support by showing that they are capable of meeting complex demands with an ever more diverse student population. Yet the twin requirements that schools show steady improvement and that teachers 'be professional' cannot plausibly be satisfied by the individual efforts of even the most capable, energetic and dedicated teachers.

One feature of steadily improving schools is that they are organized to influence

150

teaching (Bird and Little, 1986). Teaching in such schools is a public enterprise. The broad values that guide daily decisions, expectations for student learning, ideas about how children learn and what we as a society wish them to learn, the planning and conduct of instruction, recurrent dilemmas in fostering student motivation and judging student progress, the principles for organizing life in classrooms — all receive the collective attention, scrutiny, insight and refinement of peers acting as colleagues.

Schools stand to benefit in three ways from promoting closer collegial ties among teachers. Schools benefit first by simply orchestrating the daily work of teaching across classrooms. Teachers, students and parents all gain confidence in their knowledge of what is taught throughout the program and why. Teachers are better prepared to support one another's strengths and to accommodate weaknesses. Second, schools that promote teacher-to-teacher work tend to be organized to examine and test new ideas, methods and materials. They are adaptable and self-reliant in the face of new demands; they have the necessary organization to attempt school or classroom innovations that would exhaust the energy, skill or resources of an individual teacher. Finally, schools that foster collegiality are plausibly organized to ease the strain of staff turnover, both by providing systematic assistance to beginning teachers and by explicitly socializing all newcomers to staff values, traditions and resources (Little, 1985).

Colleagues and the Teaching Profession

Members of a profession are colleagues not merely in name but also with regard to the core ideas, principles and practices of their work (Etzioni, 1969; Marram *et al.*, 1972). Judged by this standard of strong peer relations, teaching is at a disadvantage. Teachers have prided themselves on their individual accomplishments; the 'culture of teaching' is grounded in values of independence (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986). Strong peer relations are not a treasured part of an occupational culture. Nor does a set of core ideas and practices form a body of disciplined knowledge upon which daily action and judgment rest (Schlechty, 1985). Unlike medicine, in which daily uncertainties and ambiguities are eased by an accepted body of practice (Fox, 1957), teaching celebrates no body of accepted pedagogical practice.

Even now the terrain that is usefully mapped by research on teaching is small. Teachers' practical knowledge has been disparaged as idiosyncratic and atheoretical ('a matter of style'), treated as having little value as a basis for collective scrutiny or action (Buchmann, 1983; Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986). Relations among teachers, either in or out of school, have not been organized to promote inquiry or to add to the intellectual capital of the profession' (Lortie, 1975, p. 56).

Responsibility for accumulating, evaluating and disseminating knowledge about teaching and learning has not been vested in teachers. Teachers have few mechanisms for adding to the knowledge base in teaching and leave no legacy of insights, methods and materials at the close of a long career (Little, 1985). The knowledge base in teaching, such as it is, receives neither the close attention nor the loyalty of those who teach or those who are preparing to teach (Lanier and Little, 1986; Book *et al.*, 1983; Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986).

Recent analyses suggest that the traditional attractions to teaching have diminished, confronting prospective teachers with 'uncertain rewards in a careerless profession' (Sykes 1983b, p. 110; see also Sykes and Devaney, 1984; Lortie, 1975). Neither the opportunity for more shared work with fellow teachers nor expanded career advancement possibilities will be substitutes for public esteem, adequate salaries and satisfactions in the classroom. Yet we would make too little of the drawing power and holding power of strong collegial ties if we failed to take account of the way teachers themselves speak of their most productive work relations.

In the past neither obligations held in common nor achievements rewarded in common have bound teachers as a group. The alliances forged by the union movement have concentrated on protecting teachers against abuses in personnel practice. The obligation that teachers owe to one another has yet to encompass matters of professional practice on any large scale. What is absent from current research findings is perhaps as telling as what is present: no one is evaluated, either positively or negatively, on the basis of contributions they have made to the knowledge base of the profession or to the teaching proficiency of others.

Recent state initiatives to expand professional opportunities and rewards in teaching (e.g., Wagner, 1985) suggest that a tightened set of collegial ties and a heightened set of collegial controls may be in the offing. These developments, both political and professional, have prospects for altering relations among colleagues in major ways. Career ladder and other incentive plans have highlighted teachers' demonstrated expertise as a basis for introducing status differences into a traditionally egalitarian profession (Bird, 1985). Under the terms of such plans, experienced senior colleagues acquire both the obligation and the opportunity to assert leadership in the improvement of teaching. Whatever efforts may be made to soften the implications (e.g., by labeling master and mentor teacher positions as 'more work for more pay'), the basic assumptions seem inescapable (Bird *et al.*, 1984). In addition, the rapid developments in classroom-based research since the mid-1970s, combined with an economic and political climate that presses schools to demonstrate 'excellence', have drawn the attention of policy-makers to the essential competence of teachers. Debates over the 'knowledge base in teaching' are no longer academic.

What Teachers Do as Colleagues

Like most broad images, collegiality shows its peculiar architecture only close up. In some schools collegiality among teachers is an inescapable fact of life and work (Little, 1982). In those schools certain critical practices are clearly in evidence.

Talk about Teaching

Colleagues talk to one another about teaching often, at a level of detail that makes their exchange both theoretically rich and practically meaningful. While teaching is not the only topic of their conversation, it is a prominent one. No visiting stranger — or new

teacher — would have to search long to uncover it. Discussions are heard in the faculty lounge, in hallways, in the office, in workrooms, in unused classrooms. The teachers' lounge is not reserved for 'letting off steam' or for 'jousting and griping' (Lieberman and Miller, 1979, p. 61; see also Woods, 1984; Hammersley, 1984).

Colleagues' efforts to speak clearly, fully and concretely about their work help to take the mystery out of teaching without diminishing its essential artistry. This helps to make clear the understandings that teachers hold about connections between their actions and student learning (Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel, 1976). It illuminates underlying principles and ideas in a way that allows teachers to understand and accommodate one another, to assist one another and sometimes to challenge one another. Productive talk about teaching is not mere shop talk. The standard of productive talk is not satisfied by casual 'war stories' or 'experience swapping' (Rosenholtz and Kyle, 1984). It requires familiarity with and high regard for principles and conclusions derived not only from immediate classroom experience (Hargreaves, 1984) but also from the thinking, experience and observations of others (Weyand, 1983).

Shared Planning and Preparation

Together, colleagues plan, prepare and evaluate the topics, methods and materials of teaching. Working in concert, they reduce their individual planning time while increasing their pool of ideas and material. In grade-level or subject-area groups, or in interdisciplinary teams, they arrive at agreements about curriculum emphasis, pace and sequence. They work together to design and prepare the content of teaching: course outlines, unit objectives, tests and other materials. They meet to evaluate the progress of students and to decide or recommend student placements. They take joint responsibility for a group of students, though instances of actual joint teaching are less common (Cohen, 1981). In all these ways they build program coherence, expand individual resources and reduce individual burdens for planning and preparation (see also Barnes and Dow, 1982).

Examples of shared planning and preparation are frequent and varied at the elementary and junior high or middle-school levels (Little, 1982; Little and Bird, 1984a; Lipsitz, 1983) but are less evident in high school. In a fruitless search for staff networks in two large mid-western high schools, Cusick (1980) encountered a well established pattern of individual entrepreneurship among teachers. Competition over student enrollments and a premium on securing students' attendance and cooperation led to a proliferation of electives that gave teachers little to discuss (or plan) with one another. (Indeed, the rewards attached to individual entrepreneurialism made more for competition than cooperation among teachers.) Teachers' involvement in student sports or other activities cut into time for shared work with other teachers, and a host of out-of-school commitments further eroded teachers' opportunities and interests in collegial pursuits. While examples of shared work are not unknown at the high school level (Bird and Little, 1985), and individual departments or small groups may prove highly cohesive (Ball and Lacey, 1984), schoolwide patterns of collegiality are far more prevalent at the elementary and middle levels.

Classroom Observation

The presence of observers in classrooms is a common event in schools that promote collegial work. Administrators in these schools devote the time and study necessary to make their own observations fruitful (Little and Bird, 1984a) and free up observation time for teachers working together on improvement projects of their own (Weyand, 1983). Increasingly, classroom observation has developed as a professional development resource for teachers at work with teachers; descriptions of peer observation, peer coaching and targeted videotaping now appear in both the research and practitioner literature (Showers, 1985).

We can distinguish between sheer 'visibility', as a fact of life in some schools, and systematic observation, as an organized practice of administration or professional development. By teaching within sight and sound of one another, as in open-space plans, teachers are made attentive to the judgments and preferences of their peers (Meyer *et al.*, 1971). By engaging in systematic observation, teachers explore central issues in student learning and consider teaching practices and their improvement (Bird and Little, 1985).

For both administrators and teachers, the requisite incentives, skills, habits and opportunities associated with good observation appear hard to come by. One recent study prompted this description:

> In one of five schools, classroom observation is so frequent, so intellectually lively and intense, so thoroughly integrated into the daily work and so associated with accomplishments for all who participate, that it is difficult to see how the practices could fail to improve teaching. In still another school, the observation practices approach this standard. In three of the five schools, however, the observation of classroom life is so cursory, so infrequent, so shapeless and tentative that if it were found to affect instruction favorably we would be hard-pressed to construct a plausible explanation. (Little and Bird, 1984a, p. 12).

Training Together and Training One Another

Colleagues teach one another about new ideas and new classroom practices, abandoning a perspective that teaching is 'just a matter of style' in favor of a perspective that favors continuous scrutiny of practices and their consequences. Without turning creative individuals into robots who all teach precisely the same way, teachers view the practices of teaching as professional practices, open to scrutiny, discussion and refinement. Formal occasions of in-service training are organized so that teachers can train together and train one another, with opportunity for follow-up in classrooms. Informal study groups provide an opportunity for teachers and administrators to 'get smarter together' and to develop small-scale experiments in curriculum, instruction and classroom management (Weyand, 1983).

A record of classroom success earns teachers in collegial schools the right (or even the obligation) to teach others, either informally through a peer-coaching arrangement or

formally in in-service workshops (Bird and Little, 1985). (Talented teachers in less collegial settings are made acutely uncomfortable at the prospect of teaching their peers; described by admirers as 'prophets without honor in their own land', such teachers confine their energies to their own classrooms or conduct in-service workshops in far-flung schools or districts.)

Each of these practices and perspectives brings teachers close to one another's work with students. Together, such views and habits have been summed up as norms of collegiality and continuous improvement (Little, 1982). They make up a pattern of joint action that relies in part on face-to-face team work and in part on other forms of coordination and mutual accommodation.

A lot of what passes for collegiality does not add up to much. When teachers meet only occasionally on questions of logistics, broad curriculum outlines or school-level matters, they are unlikely to engage in close mutual examination of how they think about teaching, plan for teaching or handle teaching demands in the classroom. Closer to the classroom is also closer to the bone — closer to the day-by-day performances on which personal esteem and professional standing rest. The prospects for conflict are high (Martin, 1975; Metz, 1984).

The closer one gets to the classroom and to central questions of curriculum and instruction, the fewer are the recorded instances of meaningful, rigorous collaboration. In case narratives of exemplary middle schools, for which interdisciplinary teaming is a central philosophical tenet, Lipsitz (1983) describes closely integrated team work in only one of four schools. In that school teachers hammer out agreements about curriculum emphasis and instructional approach and develop materials jointly. So crucial is teaming to the daily work that team members rarely miss a day's work and have been known to give 'calamity day' awards to individuals who were not devoting a full measure of time, thought and energy to the group effort. In the remaining three schools, however, teams met infrequently and team decisions had less immediate bearing on teachers' classroom decisions.

Supporting Teachers as Colleagues

The key practices of colleagues are most likely to make a difference where they are a patterned, integral, inescapable part of day-to-day work.

How Common Is Collegial Work?

Overall, collegiality is rare. Most teachers can point to a treasured colleague, but few work in schools where cooperative work is a condition of employment. Many teachers are satisfied with their peer relationships, but few claim that those relationships make their way into the classroom. Many schools offer congenial work environments, but few offer a professional environment that makes the school 'as educative for teachers as for students' (Shulman, 1983).

Pellegrin (1976) describes an effort to uncover the extent of perceived interdependence among teachers. Teachers were asked to create two lists. On the first they were to name

persons other than students on whom they depended most heavily to perform their job effectively. On the second they were to name any person whose job was so closely related to their own that the two jobs must be performed collaboratively for each to be effective. The first set was termed 'dependence relationships', and it was small (a mean of 4); the second set was labeled 'essential relationships', and it was smaller still (a range from 0 to 2.5, with a mean of 1.). Pellegrin elaborates: 'These data show that the types of relationships specified by teachers consist primarily of those that deal with the provision of resources (facilities and materials), psychological and social support, advice, and exchange of ideas. It is quite rare for *task* interdependencies to be mentioned' (p. 368; emphasis in original).

Characterizing schools as places with 'a division of labor low in interdependence' (p. 353), Pellegrin emphasizes that teachers rarely interact with one another to complete the main obligations of their work. Similarly, only one-quarter of the teachers surveyed by Lortie (1975, p. 193) reported having frequent contact with other teachers for purposes of jointly planning classes, reviewing student work or sharing responsibility for classes. Lortie concludes that task-oriented cooperation among teachers is likely to be 'permissive rather than mandatory' (p. 194; see also Cohen, 1981). Special programs (such as federally funded categorical programs) have been credited with promoting or requiring close cooperation among teachers (e.g., McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979), but most alliances among teachers appear to be informal, voluntary and distant from the real work in and of the classroom.

How Stable is Collegiality in Schools?

Collegial relations and structures have proved relatively fragile (Cohen, 1976; Cohen *et al.*, 1979). A shift in building leadership can alter the governing values and priorities, the opportunities created in a master schedule, and the incentives and rewards associated with collaborative work. Relationships, habits and structures that have taken years to build may unravel in a matter of weeks (Little and Bird, 1984b; Little and Long, 1985).

A fairly constant refrain in the literature and in the field is that cooperative work among teachers is scarce, fruitless or hard to maintain. Organized work groups come and go, or their membership changes drastically over time. When one team of researchers returned after two years to schools in which more than half the faculty had been actively involved in school-level curriculum implementation teams, they found less than 15 per cent still participating (Cohen, 1976. p. 59).

Although the term 'collegiality' may at first bring to mind face-to-face interaction among teachers, concentration on formally organized teams may have led researchers to overestimate (or wrongly conceive) the problem of instability. An example serves to illustrate. Eight middle-school teachers were intent on making the annual influx of student teachers a more productive experience. They formed a group, confirmed a group leader and met four times early in the school year to arrive at a policy to govern the involvement of university supervisors, student teachers and school-based master teachers. When they had completed their work, they ceased meeting, having agreed that each would use the policy to govern his or her own work in the student teaching program. Judged strictly by

a set of measures limited to visible face-to-face teaming, the group might have appeared 'unstable' when it ceased to gather regularly after four meetings. In fact, the group was better organized at the end than at the beginning to achieve its teacher training goals and to preserve the integrity of valued approaches to curriculum and instruction (Little and Bird, 1984b, p. 13).

The problem of stability can be pursued as a problem of sustaining a pattern of cooperative work among a 'reciprocally interdependent staff' (Cohen, 1981, p. 188). The central question about collegiality thus becomes, 'under what conditions would we expect to find relations among teachers that were rigorous enough and durable enough to have any demonstrable effect on conceptions and practices of teaching?' (Little and Bird, 1984b, p. 8). Two fundamental conditions appear crucial to joint action among teachers: interdependence and opportunity. Shifts in either condition may produce a fluctuation in visible group effort ('instability').

Interdependence

Teachers are interdependent when they must depend on one another, regardless of personal preference. Interdependence is not chosen but is imposed by circumstance. It is one thing for teachers to depend on each other to observe the bell schedule. It is quite another for them to depend on each other for information about good teaching practices or for lesson plans designed according to shared pedagogical principles. To be relevant to their joint action, interdependence must be perceived or felt in some way by teachers. The perspective taken here is consistent with Pellegrin's (1976) orientation to essential relationships but differs from the stance taken in some of the early teaming studies, in which the term 'interdependence' is used interchangeably with 'interaction', 'cooperation', or 'co-presence' (Bredo, 1977; Cohen, 1981).

Opportunity

Joint action cannot occur where it is impossible or prohibitively costly in organizational, political or personal terms. Bureaucratic conditions such as schedules, staff assignments and access to resources may or may not be conducive to shared work among teachers. Cultural conditions, including beliefs and norms of interaction among teachers, may permit, support or discourage close collaboration.

Interdependence and opportunity have no necessary relation. Persons can understand fully that they are dependent on one another in some crucial ways that affect their respective reputations and fortunes but still have no opportunity to work together for mutual benefit. Persons may have substantial opportunity for work together but be at a loss to understand why it is important that they should or what would be sacrificed if they did not.

How Are Collegial Relations Supported in Schools?

The habits and skills of colleagueship cannot be mastered alone. Further, they are not readily introduced by the initiative of a single teacher, however skillful and well

intentioned. This may seem a painfully obvious point, but it is meant to underscore the organizational as well as professional character of collegiality. Six dimensions of support are prominent in the literature: (1) symbolic endorsements and rewards that place value on cooperative work and make the sources of interdependence clear; (2) school-level organization of staff assignments and leadership; (3) latitude for influence on crucial matters of curriculum and instruction; (4) time; (5) training and assistance; and (6) material support.

Public Endorsements and Institutional Policy

Principals and others in positions of influence promote collegiality by declaring that they value team efforts and by describing in some detail what they think that means. A teacher leader in one school emphasizes, 'It's important to *say the words*,' while a teacher in another school laments, 'They may believe it's important, and I agree, but that's never been communicated (Little and Long, 1985). Among Lipsitz's (1983) successful middle schools the most heavily teamed school was one in which the principal and team leaders conveyed their own faith in the power of interdisciplinary teams to make the school better for students. In schools where teaming came lower on a principal's list of priorities, cooperative efforts were less frequent, less focused on fundamental questions of curriculum and classroom instruction, and less binding on the decisions of individual teachers in classrooms.

High levels of joint action are more likely to persist where there is a 'policy' in favor of teaming, in which the reasons for interdependence are articulated by both district-level and school-level leaders, and opportunity is afforded by the routine organization of staff assignments, time and other resources (Cohen, 1981). In a study of adminsitrators' influence on teachers' collegiality and innovation Bird and Little (1985) confirmed earlier speculation that school-level support for teaming required a combination of public endorsements, material and technical support, opportunity and reward. Districts promote teaming (or not) in part through the policies and procedures they employ for selecting, placing and evaluating principals (Little and Long, 1985). Together, districts and schools where shared work prevails have a policy of teamed work explicitly tied to improvement goals. Working together is 'the way we do things here.'

School Organization and Teacher Leadership

Cooperative work among teachers, as a matter of organizational principle or institutional priority, is the exception rather than the rule in American schools. One might be led to ask, 'What have the environment and norms of schools to do with teachers' performance as . . . colleagues and leaders in the advancement of teaching?' (Bird and Little, 1985b, p. 13).

School-level reorganization into teams has been found to increase interaction, collegial influence and reciprocal influence (Cohen, 1981). In one of four middle schools portrayed by Lipsitz (1983), each of eight academic teams is responsible (as a team) for the learning experiences of approximately 150 students. Each team has relative autonomy with respect to scheduling, grouping assignments, staff assignments and the development of curriculum units or instructional approaches. With the encouragement of the principal,

and led by assigned team leaders, these academic teams take full advantage of organizational resources. They use their common planning times to arrive at agreements about curriculum, instruction and the organization of students. In this case, the *opportunity* to work together afforded by the schedule and by the staff organization is matched by teachers' felt *obligation* to work together on behalf of students.

Team-based staff organization goes a long way toward permitting cooperative work but does not guarantee it. In yet other middle schools studied by Lipsitz, for example, teachers assigned to the same teams or 'houses' met only in a perfunctory manner to resolve routine matters of scheduling or student placement and had little to do with each other on issues that strike close to the heart of daily classroom experience. Even in the one highly teamed school, commitment to the team ethos is uneven. In contrast to the eight academic teams, the unified arts team in the same building has neither a small community of students to call its own (student loyalties are to academic teams), nor a compelling interest in producing a coordinated curriculum, nor daily common planning periods in which to develop any version of a combined program. The experience of teaming has been far less rewarding (and rewarded) for the unified arts teachers than for teachers on the academic teams.

One aspect of a team work policy appears to be a form of organization in which leadership is broadly distributed among both administrators and teachers, who in turn provide groups with direction, continuity and support. In schools where teaming has been well established, a common pattern has been to invest team leaders, department heads, grade-level chairs or resource teachers with special authority for organizing and leading work on curriculum and instruction (Lipsitz, 1983, Little and Bird, 1984b). The main contribution of the principals in team-oriented middle schools has been 'to make the school larger than one person' (Lipsitz, 1983, p. 284).

Although the assignment of teachers to formal leadership positions is a departure from established precedent in the teaching profession, it is an accepted tradition in some schools. Lipsitz describes a group of team leaders who, with reduced teaching loads, are responsible for leading curriculum development and other improvement-related work in an exemplary middle school; they receive no more pay than their colleagues, but receive reduced teaching loads and other perks of status, such as dinner with out-of-town visitors at a good restaurant (Lipsitz, 1983). A study of leadership in junior and senior high schools provides still other examples (Bird and Little, 1985). Informal teacher leaders in a junior high school receive no more money than their colleagues but 'settle for fame'. Increasingly, they are called on to conduct in-service training in their own and other schools and to consult with administrators, policy-makers and researchers. In a senior high school the role of department head has been moved steadily away from book ordering and other paperwork toward responsibilities for curriculum development, program evaluation and consultation with teachers.

Establishing effective team leadership and cultivating reciprocity and respect among team members turn out to be complex tasks in their own right. Most school-based teams, unlike work groups in industry, tend to be equal-status groups in which leadership roles are rarely assigned and in which professional deference is simply assumed ('you just have to be a decent person'). The equal-status assumption is compelling. Even when principals speak of team leaders, teachers may deny their existence (Cohen, 1981) or their

effectiveness (Arikado, 1976). Other studies have demonstrated that there are almost no mechanisms by which teachers can emerge as leaders for purposes of leading work on teaching, even when they have been acknowledged as exemplary classroom teachers (Bird, 1985).

Latitude for Influence

Teachers' investment in team planning appears to rest heavily on the latitude they have to make decisions in crucial areas of curriculum, materials selection, student assignments, instructional grouping, classroom activity and the assessment of student progress. One junior high school principal supported curriculum projects and study groups on instructional research as the vehicles for building teachers' involvement with one another and their collective attention to program improvement (Weyand, 1983). In another school fiercely committed to a team structure, the principal negotiated with district curriculum supervisors to win his teachers the right to design and use their own curriculum units (Lipsitz, 1983).

Work together requires some topic of compelling importance to work on. (Teaming for the sake of teaming is predictably short-lived). Teams are more likely to form when the work at hand is complex enough to make two (or six) heads better than one and to make it probable that the reflected glory of the team will outshine success that each member could expect from working alone. According to Cohen (1981), complex tasks generate uncertainty, for which lateral relations between teachers serve as a source of problem-solving, information processing and coordination.

Forces outside the school curtail teachers' latitude and incentive to act. Some are the legacy of a 'feminized' occupational culture in which teachers (mostly women) nurture the young and administrators (mostly men) tend to issues of policy, program and management (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986; Boston Women's Teachers' Group, 1983). Other forces reflect the battle currently being waged over the control of teaching and teachers. As states specify curriculum standards and as districts move toward uniform curriculum content, teachers have less apparent room to explore curriculum alternatives. The proliferation of classroom-based research has spawned efforts to create ever more prescriptive, technically precise requirements for effective teaching, eroding still further teachers' latitude or obligation to exercise professional judgment or to articulate professional values. As a decade of research on effective teaching and effective schools makes its way to state legislatures and local school boards, research discoveries are converted to evaluation criteria and competency standards. In the view of Sara Freedman and her colleagues this increasingly prescriptive stance echoes the nineteenth century, when, ironically, 'the highly prescriptive nature of teaching — in which neither teacher nor student could deviate from a set norm — exonerated both of them from responsibility for upgrading the education of pupils' (Boston Women's Teachers' Group, 1983, p. 277). In some states simultaneous efforts to expand teacher incentive plans and to control the quality of instruction and curriculum are in considerable tension. Such forces operate in many respects from a distance. They are necessarily mediated by the day-to-day forces that operate closer to the school and the classroom, but they cannot be ignored.

Time and the Master Schedule

Common planning periods, regularly scheduled team or subject-area meetings and the judicious use of release time all support cooperative work among teachers (Weyand, 1983; Little and Bird, 1984b). The opportunities for collaborative work among teachers are enhanced or eroded by the school's master schedule. The master schedule determines whether any two teachers who have students, subjects or other interests in common will have time together during the school day. The master schedule makes room, or not, for all teachers to be available for a block of time each day or each week. The master schedule gives reason, or not, for teachers to work together on a program for a group of students taught in common. Differences in scale are crucial. 'Morning meetings,' made possible by an all-school early-morning planning period, allow teachers to work on problems of curriculum and instruction with the persistence and regularity needed to achieve continuity and depth or to resolve disagreements. Monthly or quarterly meetings, say teachers, cannot have the same effect.

Training and Assistance

To forge a group that lasts through time (and through tough times) and that creates achievement worth celebrating is no small challenge. Most teachers can imagine an 'ideal' team; many have been part of at least one group that has taken pride in its accomplishments. Most can also tell tales of teams gone awry, situations in which they have given more than they have received or have been bored, frustrated, confused, overburdened, insulted or insulting.

Cooperative work places unfamiliar and pressing demands on teachers. In an environment where teachers work mostly with students, mostly out of sight and sound of others, cooperative work among adults is often less polished and practiced. In a profession in which the norm of not interfering with another teacher's views or practices is powerful, serious and sustained collaboration with regard to curriculum and instruction represents a radical departure.

Teachers work groups succeed in part by mastering specific skills and by developing explicit agreements to govern their work together. One observer of team work comment. 'Team meetings have been observed where no one has helped team members with such simple techniques for saving time as using an agenda' (Cohen, 1976, p. 61). Task-related training and assistance bolster the confidence that teachers have in one another for work outside the classroom, as in long-term planning, curriculum development or peer observation. Assistance in effective group process and group leadership has helped teachers master the routines of scheduling regular meetings, using an agenda, prioritizing issues, facilitating discussion and reaching closure on decisions and tasks. The ability to distinguish issues that deserve group attention from those that can be handled by a team leader or can be left to individual prerogative can keep a group from becoming bogged down in an 'overreliance on consensus' (Cohen, 1981, p. 186). Participants in groups with clear internal policies regarding participation have consistently been more satisfied with their work together (Bredo, 1977).

Even in less formal collaborations, specific skills and perspectives of working with a colleague are critical. In effect, teachers count on their collective ability to do good work

on the problems of teaching without doing damage to one another as teachers. They sum up their accomplishments as 'trust'. Recent portraits of collegial relations among teachers have shed some light on the mysteries of trust (Little *et al.*, 1984). Lacking the intimacy that confirms trust among family members or long-time friends, team members must rely on other evidence that they do not intend harm to one another. They create trust as the consequence, not the precondition, of close interaction by displaying professional reciprocity clearly and concretely in each small exchange.

Among the guarantors of reciprocity are (1) *shared language* for describing and analyzing the problems of curriculum and instruction; (2) *predictability* in group dealings, including rules for group process and especially for airing and resolving disagreements; (3) talk that concentrates on *practices and their consequences* rather than people and their competence; and (4) *sharing equally in the obligations* to work hard, to credit one another's contributions, and to risk looking ignorant, clumsy or foolish.

Material Support

The quality and availability of reference texts and other materials, adequate copying equipment, consultants on selected problems and other forms of material and human support appear to be crucial — but often under estimated — contributors to teachers' ability and willingness to work successsfully together. In one study (Bird and Little, 1985) teachers in one junior high school and one high school regarded themselves as well supported (as entire faculties) in part because they had large, multicapability copying machines staffed by aides. In these schools teachers had both time and inclination to plan together. In two other high schools, where 100 teachers competed for time at two small and fragile copiers, entire planning periods were spent standing in line; time and inclination for group work were in short supply.

At its strongest — most durable, most rigorously connected to problems of student learning, most commanding of teachers' energies, talents and loyalties — cooperative work is a matter of school policy. Team efforts receive public endorsements and accolades; are supported by time, space, materials and staff assignments; and are demonstrably tied to the school's ability to educate the young. Teachers tackle tasks of adequate complexity to require and reward individuals' participation. Team leadership is adequate to ensure continuity, direction and full participation. Together, these aspects of policy and support may lend stability and continuity to joint action among teachers, equipping them to orchestrate the daily work of teaching, to get better at their work over time and to provide adequate support to inexperienced teachers.

Conclusion

Serious collaboration, by which teachers engage in the rigorous mutual examination of teaching and learning, turns out to be rare. Teachers create realistic, insightful chronicles of the difficulties they encounter. Collaborative efforts run counter to historical precedent, tending to be unstable, short-lived and secondary to other priorities. Compromises in substance are made to preserve camaraderie (or camaraderie alone is mistaken for sturdier

stuff). As teachers probe issues close to the classroom, they generate heat as well as light. An emphasis on cooperation may place a premium on coherence and uniformity at the expense of individual inventiveness and independent initiative. Cooperation on any meaningful scale will almost certainly require rethinking the present organization of human and material resources.

Yet the enthusiasms expressed by teachers about their collaborations are persuasive. When schools are organized to promote joint action, the advantages of collegial work groups are varied and substantial. Teachers' work as colleagues promises greater coherence and integration to the daily work of teaching. It equips individuals, groups and institutions for steady improvement; and it helps to organize the schools as an environment for learning to teach.

The professional relations that we might legitimately describe as collegial are neither mysterious nor subtle. Colleagues stand out. They can be seen and heard. The value placed on joint action is heard in the talk among teachers who pursue questions or joint projects even in odd moments during a crowded day. It is evident when teachers invite observation, seek opportunities to watch others at work or coach one another to master specific new classroom approaches. It is evident when teachers organize to 'get smarter together.' Colleagues can be found before and after school, with materials spread out on a table and discussion in full swing; individuals argue some preferences fiercely and put aside others, with the intent of arriving at agreements they can live with. Finally, colleagues make themselves felt by organizing to make the study of teaching and the work of teaching public, to learn from and with one another.

The institutional supports for collegiality, where they exist, are, like the practices themselves, neither subtle nor mysterious. Humans are remarkably sturdy and stubborn characters. No one can make anyone do much of anything, whether it's to teach well or to work well with others. Both, at bottom, are labors of love and skill. Neither can be coerced, but both can be supported. Faculties who work together are by nature no more generous in spirit, quick in mind, lively in humor or inventive in action than faculties in other schools, but by habit and interaction, they come to appear so.

For teachers to work often and fruitfully as colleagues requires action on all fronts. The *value* that is placed on shared work must be both said and shown. The *opportunity* for shared work and shared study must be prominent in the schedule for the day, the week, the year. The *purpose* for work together must be compelling and the task sufficiently challenging. The *material resources and human assistance* must be adequate. The *accomplishments* of individuals and groups must be recognized and celebrated.

The press toward steady improvement of schools, teaching and teacher education lends urgency to the continuing study of professional relations among teachers as colleagues. Research since the mid-1970s has come close to the internal lives of classrooms and schools, with substantial gain. Foremost in the gains we can expect in the 1980s and 1990s will be new understandings of how, and with what effect, schools promote leadership in teaching by teachers.

References

ARIKADO, M. S. (1976) 'Status Congruence As It Relates to Team Teachers Satisfaction,' *Journal of Educational Administration*, 14: 70–8.

ASHTON, P., WEBB, R., and DODA, N. (1982) *A Study of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy* (Final Report to the National Instiutute of Education No. 400–79–0075). Gainesville, FL: University of Florida, College of Education.

BALL, S. J. and LACEY, C. (1984) 'Subject Disciplines as the Opportunity for Group Action: A Measured Critique of Subject Sub-cultures', in A. HARGREAVES and P. WOODS (eds), *Classrooms and Staffrooms: The Sociology of Teachers and Teaching*. Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

BARNES, R., and DOW, G. (1982) 'Looking at Topic-centred Teaching', in G. DOW (ed.), *Teacher Learning*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

BARNETT, B. (1982) 'Subordinate Teacher Power and Influence in Schools.' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March.

BIRD, T. D. (1985) 'The Formation of Instrumental Status Differences among Teachers.' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April.

BIRD, T. D., and LITTLE, J. W. (1985) *Instructional Leadership in Eight Secondary Schools* (Final report to the National Institute of Education). Boulder, CO: Center for Action Research.

BIRD, T. D. and LITTLE, J. W. (1986) 'How Schools Organize the Teaching Occupation.' *Elementary School Journal*, 86 (4): 495–511. Prepared originally for the California Commission on the Teaching Profession.

BIRD, T. D., SHULMAN, J., ST. CLAIR, G. and LITTLE, J. W. (1984) *Expanded Teacher Roles: Mentors and Masters, Interim Report*. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory.

BLAU, P. and SCOTT, W. R. (1962) *Formal Organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Chandler.

BOOK, C., BYERS, J. and FREEMAN, D. (1983) 'Student Expectations and Teacher Education Traditions with Which We Can and Cannot Live,' *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(1): 9–13.

BORKO, H., LALIK, R., BARKSDALE, M. and YON, M. (1985) 'What is Successful Teaching? An Examination of Student Teachers' Developing Understandings of Teaching.' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April.

BOSTON WOMEN'S TEACHERS' GROUP (S. Freedman, J. Jackson and K. Boles) (1983) 'Teaching: An Imperiled "Profession" ' in L. SHULMAN and G. SYKES (eds), *Handbook of Teaching and Policy*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

BREDO, E. (1975) *Collaborative Relationships on Teaching Problems: Implications for Collegial Influence, Team Morale, and Instructional Practices* (Tech. Rep. No. 45). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

BREDO, E. (1977) 'Collaborative Relations among Elementary School Teachers.' *Sociology of Education*, 50: 300–9.

BUCHMANN, M. (1983) *The Use of Research Knowledge in Teacher Education and Teaching* (Occasional Paper No. 71). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

BUSSIS, A. M., CHITTENDEN, E. A. and AMAREL, M. (1976) *Beyond Surface Curriculum: An Interview Study of Teachers' Understandings*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY (1984) A Comprehensive Plan for Improvement of Pre-service Teacher Education through Clinical Supervision of Student Teachers. Long Beach, CA: Office of the Chancellor.

CAREER LADDER RESEARCH GROUP (1984) *Career Ladders in Utah: A Preliminary Study*. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah and Utah State Office of Education.

CLARK, C. (1984) 'Research on Teaching and the Content of Teacher Education,' Symposium presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April.

COHEN, E. (1976) 'Problems and Prospects of Teaming,' *Educational Research Quarterly*, 1:49–63.

COHEN, E. (1981) 'Sociology Looks at Team Teaching,' *Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization*, 2: 163–93.

COHEN, E., DEAL, T. E., MEYER, J. E. and SCOTT, W. R. (1979) 'Technology and Teaming in the Elementary School,' *Sociology of Education*, 52: 20–33.

COPELAND, W. D. and JAMGOCHIAN, R. (1985) 'Colleague Training and Peer Review,' *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(2): 18–21.

CUSICK, P. A. (1980) *A Study of Networks Among Professional Staffs of Two Secondary Schools*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

DARLING-HAMMOND, L. (1984) 'The Toledo (Ohio) Public School Intern and Intervention Programs,' in A. WISE, L. DARLING-HAMMOND, M. W. MCLAUGHLIN and H. T. BERNSTEIN (eds.), *Case Studies for Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

DOYLE, W. and NESPOR, J. (1984) *Learning to Teach*. Austin, TX: University of Texas, Research and Development Center in Teacher Education.

ETZIONI, A. (1969) *The Semi-professions and Their Organization*. New York: Free Press.

FEIMAN-NEMSER, S. and BUCHMANN, M. (1985) 'On What is Learned in Student Teaching: Appraising the Experience,' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April.

FEIMAN-NEMSER, S. and FLODEN, R. (1986) 'The Cultures of Teaching,' in M. WITTROCK (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. 3rd ed. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association, pp. 505–26.

FOX, R. (1957) 'Training for Uncertainty,' in R. MERTON, G. READER and P. KENDALL, (eds.), *The Student Physician*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

FUCHS, E. (1969) *Teachers Talk: Views from Inside City Schools*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

GEHRKE, N. J. and KAY, R. S. (1984) 'The Socialization of Beginning Teachers Through Mentor-Protégé Relationships,' *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35 (3): 21–4.

GLICKMAN, C. D. (1985) 'The Supervisor's Challenge: Changing the Teacher's Work Environment,' *Educational Leadership*, 42(4): 38–40.

GOODMAN, L. and LIEBERMAN, A. (1985) 'Effective Assister Behavior: What They Brought and What They Learned,' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April.

GRIFFIN, G., BARNES, S., HUGHES, R., JR., O'NEAL, S., DEFINO, M., EDWARDS, S. and HUKILL, H. (1983) *Clinical Preservice Teacher Education: Final Report of a Descriptive Study*. Austin, TX: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

HAMMERSLEY, M. (1984) 'Staffroom News,' in A. HARGREAVES and P. WOODS (eds.), *Classrooms and Staffrooms: The Sociology of Teachers and Teaching*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

HARGREAVES, A. (1984) 'Experience Counts, Theory Doesn't: How Teachers Talk about Their Work,' *Sociology of Education*, 57: 244–54.

INTILI, J. K. (1977) *Structural Conditions in the School that Facilitate Reflective Decision Making*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

JOHNSON, R. (1976) *Teacher Collaboration, Principal Influence and Decision-making in Elementary Schools* (Tech. Rep. No. 48). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

JOHNSON, S. M. (1982) *Teacher Unions and the Schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Institute for Educational Policy Studies.

KENT, K. (1985) *A Sucessful Program of Teachers Assisting Teachers*. San Rafael, CA: Marin County Office of Education.

LACEY, C. (1977) *The Socialization of Teachers*. London: Methuen.

LANIER, J. (1983) Tensions in Teaching the Skills of Pedagogy, in G. GRIFFIN (ed.), *Staff development*. 82nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

LANIER, J. E. with LITTLE, J. W. (1986) 'Research on Teacher Education,' in M. WITTROCK (ed.), *Handbook of Research in Teaching*. 3rd ed. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association, pp. 527–69.

LIEBERMAN, A. and MILLER, L. (1979) 'The Social Realities of Teaching,' in A. LIEBERMAN and L. MILLER (eds.), *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*. New York: Teachers College Press.

LIEBERMAN, A. and MILLER, L. (1984) *Teachers: Their World and Their Work*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

LIPSITZ, J. (1983) *Successful Schools for Young Adolescents*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.

LITTLE, J. W. (1981) *School Success and Staff Development: The Role of Staff Development in Urban Desegregated Schools*. Boulder, CO: Center for Action Research.

LITTLE, J. W. (1982) 'Norms of Collegialty and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions of School Success,' *American Educational Research Journal*, 19: 325–40.

LITTLE, J. W. (1985) 'Schools' Contributions to Teaching as a Profession,' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April.

LITTLE, J. W. and BIRD, T. D. (1984a) 'Is There Instructional Leadership in High Schools? First Findings from a Study of Secondary School Administrators and Their Influence on Teachers' Professional Norms,' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orelans, April.

LITTLE, J. W. and BIRD, T. D. (1984b) *Report on a Pilot Study of School-level Collegial Teaming*. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory.

LITTLE, J. W. and LONG, C. (1985) *Portraits of School-based Collegial Teams*. San Francisco, CA, Far West Laboratory.

LITTLE, J. W., GALAGARAN, P. and O'NEAL, R. (1984) *Professional Development Roles and Relationships: Principles and Skills of Advising*. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory.

LORTIE, D. (1975) *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

LYONS, G. and MCCLEARY, L. (1980) 'Careers in Teaching,' in E. HYLE and J. MEGARRY (eds.), *World Yearbook of Education 1980: Professional Development of Teachers*. London: Kogan Page.

MCDONALD, F. J. (1980) *Study of Induction Programs for Beginning Teachers*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

MCLAUGHLIN, M. W. and MARSH, D. D. (1979) 'Staff Development and School Change,' in A. LIEBERMAN and L. MILLER (eds.), *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*. New York: Teachers College Press.

MARRAM, G. D., DORNBUSH, S. and SCOTT, W. R. (1972) *The Impact of Teaming and Visibility of Teaching in the Professionalism of Elementary School Teachers* (Tech. Rep. No. 33). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

MARTIN, W. B. W. (1975) 'The Negotiated Order of Teachers in Team Teaching Situations,' *Sociology of Education*, 48: 202–22.

METZ, M. H. (1984) 'Faculty Culture: A Case Study,' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Assocation, San Antonio, TX, August.

MEYER, J., COHEN, E., BRUNETTI, F., MOLNAR, S. and LEUDERS-SALMON, E. (1971) *The Impact of the Open-space School upon Teacher Influence and Autonomy: The Effects of an Organizational*

Innovation (Tech. Rep. No. 21). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

MITCHELL, D., ORTIZ, F. and MITCHELL, T. (1983) *Work Orientation and Job Performance: The Cultural Basis of Teaching Rewards and Incentives* (Report prepared for the National Institute of Education, Grant No. NIE-G-80-0154). Riverside: University of California.

MOLNAR, S. (1971) *Teachers in Teams: Interaction, Influence and Autonomy* (Tech. Rep. No. 22). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

NEMSER, S. F. (1983) 'Learning to Teach,' in L. S. SHULMAN and G. SYKES (eds.), *Handbook of Teaching and Policy*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

NEWBERRY, J. M. (1977) 'The First Year of Experience: Influences on Beginning Teachers,' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April.

PELLEGRIN, R. J. (1976) 'Schools as Work Settings,' in R. DUBIN (ed.), *Handbook of Work Organization, and Society*. Skokie, IL: Rand McNally.

ROSENHOLTZ, S. J. and KYLE, S. J. (1984) 'Teacher isolation: Barrier to Professionalism,' *American Educator*, Winter, 10–15.

RUTTER, M., MAUGHAN, B., MORTIMORE, P., OUSTON, J. and SMITH, A. (1979) *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

RYAN, K. (1970) *Don't Smile until Christmas: Accounts of the First Year of Teaching*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

SCHLECHTY, P. (1984) 'A School District Revises the Functions and Rewards of Teaching,' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April.

SCHLECHTY, P. (1985) 'Teaching as a Profession: What We Know and What We Need to Know about Teachers,' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April.

SCHMUCK, K., RUNKEL, P. and LANGMEYER, D. (1971) 'Using Group Problem-solving Proceedures,' in R. A. SCHMUCK and M. B. MILES (eds.), *Organizational Development in Schools*. Washington, DC: National Press Books.

SHOWERS, B. (1985) 'Teachers Coaching Teachers,' *Educational Leadership*, 42(7): 43–8.

SHULMAN, L. S. (1983) 'A Perspective on Effective Schools,' in *Making Our Schools More Effective: Proceedings of Three State Conferences*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD (1984) *State Actions: Career Ladders and Other Incentive Plans for School Teachers and Administrators*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

SYKES, G. (1983a) 'Contradictions, Ironies and Promises Unfulfilled: A Contemporary Account of the Status of Teaching,' *Phi Delta Kappan*, 65: 87–93.

SYKES, G. (1983b) 'Public Policy and the Problem of Teacher Quality: The Need for Screens and Magnets,' in L. SHULMAN and G. SYKES (eds.), *Handbook of Teaching and Policy*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

SYKES, G. and DEVANEY, K. (1984) *A Status Report on the Teaching Profession*. Prepared for the California Commission on the Teaching Profession.

TISHER, R. (1980) 'The Induction of Beginning Teachers,' in E. HOYLE and J. MEGARRY (eds.), *World Yearbook of Education 1980: Professional Development of Teachers*. London: Kogan Page.

VEENMAN, S. (1984) 'Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers,' *Review of Educational Research*, 54: 143–78.

WAGNER, L. (1985) 'The Mentor Teacher Program: California's Foray into Differentiated Staffing,' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April.

WEYAND, J. (1983) *Reflections on Getting Good*. Prepared for the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco. Loveland, CO: Thompson Valley School District.

WILBURN, K. T. and DRUMMOND, R. C. (1984) 'Peer Supervision: A Study of Peer Teachers in Florida's Beginning Teacher Program,' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April.

WOODS, P. (1984) 'The Meaning of Staffroom Humour,' in A. HARGREAVES and P. WOODS (eds.), *Classrooms and Staffrooms: The Sociology of Teachers and Teaching*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Chapter 10

Leadership for Curriculum Improvement: The School Administrator's Role*

Gary A. Griffin

The role and function of school-level administrators in curriculum improvement provide the focus of this chapter. This emphasis rests on the belief that the school is the logical unit for improvement in terms of planning, implementing, studying, revising and institutionalizing curriculum change.[1] It also builds from the understanding that the contact between the curriculum and the student takes place in classrooms and in schools. Therefore, although the district level of leadership is important for thinking about policy, providing support for curriculum improvement, ensuring material support for school-level work and monitoring the process of school change, the work of curriculum change is logically the work of teachers and administrators in schools and classrooms.

The point of view taken here is somewhat different from what has become typical in exhortations for principals, for example, to be 'curriculum leaders'. The usual claim for such leadership emphasizes curriculum planning skills, knowledge of bodies of curriculum-related literature, maintaining an up-to-date understanding of advances in curriculum materials and so on. In other words, suggestions about what the principal's role in curriculum improvement ought to be have rested mainly upon knowledge and skill that is inherent in being a curriculum expert.

I take the position in this chapter that the claims for leadership noted above are unrealistic and very wide of the mark in terms of making significant school-level curriculum changes. They are unrealistic because of the competing claims for principals' intellectual, personal and emotional energy. If the principal is expected to be an expert in curriculum, is it not also logical that the principal should be an instructional expert, a testing and evaluation expert, a pupil personnel expert, a school-community relations expert and an expert in the fiscal management of a big business? Clearly, the levels of expertise required across the multiple components of the school as a complex organization cannot be located in every principal in every school. When one makes such claims for expert status in curriculum, one must recognize that there are equally pressing claims for that status in other aspects of the operation of an effective school.

*This chapter was published originally in *Critical Issues in Curriculum: Eighty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, (NSSE, 1988), pp. 244–66. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

The principal must be sensitive and skillful in manipulating a complex environment, one part of which is the curriculum enterprise.[2] Knowledge and skill related to the doing of curriculum development and implementation are important, but they are not sufficient to successful curriculum innovation at the school level. The principal, in this case, should know the rudiments of the curriculum planning process, have a set of criteria against which to make judgments about curriculum-in-use and be able to engage in curriculum-related discourse and debate. But he or she need not be the theoretical and technical expert that has often been assumed by those concerned with curriculum improvement.

The persistent belief in the expert status position for school principals derives, in part, from a conception of teaching and schooling wherein principals are 'management' and teachers are 'labor'. In this conception there is a hierarchical system of power and authority, with the concomitant feature that the needed expertise is passed from the manager to the worker. In other words, management needs the knowledge and skill to direct the activities of the workers.[3]

It has become increasingly clear from the past two decades of research on what constitutes effective schools and effective teachers that a conception of schooling quite different from the labor metaphor is consistently associated with outstanding schools and teachers. This emerging set of understandings considers the teacher as a classroom executive, a professional whose responsibilities and functions center on convincing students to learn as a consequence of the exercise of options through complex classroom decision-making in an uncertain environment, and who participates in the decision-making that affects both the daily activities and future work of the school.[4]

The distinctions between the two metaphors, teachers as workers and teachers as classroom executives, have significant consequences for the ways that principals and teachers interact, for how principals select objects for their work and for how curriculum improvement, in terms of the purposes of this chapter, is carried forward.

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to an explication of how school principals would promote curriculum work if the metaphor of teacher as classroom executive were used as a basic guide for leadership. Research evidence to support the use of this metaphor is included. The chapter ends with a set of recommendations about how principal preparation programs might be reconceptualized to make the use of the classroom executive metaphor more prevalent in schools.

The Teacher as Classroom Executive and School Leader

The way that a leader conceives of his or her role in relation to colleagues is dramatically influenced by the explicit or implicit view that is held about those colleagues. A school principal who thinks of teachers as subordinate workers will more than likely engage in activities that promote centralized decision-making, following rules and regulations, adherence to fairly inflexible expectations for teacher behavior, little widespread inquiry, a top-down evaluation and assessment scheme and a traditional management orientation to accomplishing the work of the school. There will be little sharing of decision-making, few opportunities to collaborate across conventional grade-level or subject boundaries, little variation in teaching in the school and few rewards for experimentation. This picture is

probably more true of schools in the United States than some of us would like to believe.

Of course, other views of teaching and teachers have made modest appearances in the past several decades. During the heyday of the open education movement, teachers were often thought of as 'gardeners', people who tilled the academic soil, made certain that the intellectual and affective seeds were planted and tended to the natural intellectual and social growth that was expected to occur with young people. Another metaphor that was prevalent for a time was what might be considered 'teacher as travel guide', someone who took children and youth on journeys of the mind and spirit, pointing out to them the highlights of the cultural panorama while allowing the learning outcomes of the students' contact with the environment to be directed largely by the students themselves.[5] These two metaphors for the central functions of teachers, as gardeners or as travel guides, emerged from a point of view and a body of knowledge about the nature of childhood. They gained their status from a set of understandings and beliefs about how children and youth learn. In effect, they were responses to what we know, or think we know, about the healthy learning and development of the young in our culture.

However, the most dominant and persistent metaphor, again derived from ways of thinking about learning, was and is teacher as 'storyteller'. Although the word 'storyteller' may suggest somewhat frivolous activity, just the opposite is the case. Because students do not know what they need to know, it is believed, it is the duty and responsibility of the teacher to make present what teachers and other authorities in the culture believe is necessary knowledge and disposition for a satisfying and productive life. In this view curricula are developed apart from students, modest attention is paid to standardized growth and development patterns, instruction is judged for goodness based upon its efficiency in accomplishing determined objectives and the teacher is the repository of what is to be presented to and known by children.

Independent of and in contradiction to many aspects of these conceptions is the persistence of the already mentioned teacher-as-worker orientation. Although there have been some significant attempts to restructure schools such that teachers share in the leadership functions with principals and other administrators (the teacher center movement comes to mind) these organizational experiments most often are additions to rather than dramatic changes in schools as organizations.[6] For example, the teacher centers that have been institutionalized around the country are usually the result of an often uneasy agreement between a teachers union and a school district to put together a resource for teachers that is planned and managed by teachers but exists relatively independently from the school workplace. Leadership certainly is vested in the teachers in these instances, but that leadership is exerted away from schools.

Despite a small number of exceptions, schools in general are hierarchical organizations in which the principal and perhaps his or her immediate administrative staff are expected to provide leadership and direction while teachers are expected to do the work of teaching such that it 'fits' the expectations of the leadership cadre. It is in these very typical school situations that teachers either accept their worker status, often making alterations around the margins of practice, or where they begin to express to themselves and, increasingly, to others their dissatisfaction with what have come to be called 'conditions of work'.[7]

Too often we think of conditions of work in schools solely in terms of the physical

environment and student population factors. The phrase conjures up broken windows, graffiti-laden hallways, trash piled up in corners of schoolyards and other examples of a harsh institutional environment. It also stereotypically brings to mind recalcitrant children and youth who combine the problematic features of reluctance to learn with bringing about through their own misbehavior dangerous conditions for peers and adults alike. When one moves beyond these stereotypes, however, it becomes sharply apparent that the phrase 'conditions of work' refers to a large set of personal and professional variables. It includes teachers' personal feelings of indignity, sometimes outrage, at being excluded from decision-making about school practices.[8] It stands for the recognition that preparation for a profession, often a significant human and material investment, often leads only to a job, one that has few institutionalized choice points for taking a path that leads to increased status and greater responsibility. (Teachers, for the most part, must move out of teaching to achieve career advancement within educational organizations.) Also 'conditions of work' refers to the presence or absence of real or ceremonial rewards for exemplary service.

It is not necessary to elaborate further. The present times are witness to calls for major reform in these and other conditions of work. The central theme of the reform agenda seems to be paying serious intellectual and practical attention to increasing the status of teachers toward that of true professionals. To some, this movement seems to diminish the role of the principal. A particularly dramatic example of this perception is the confusion surrounding the Carnegie recommendation to establish a 'lead teacher' role and the Holmes Group's call for preparation of 'career professional teachers', both proposals firmly rooted in a conception of teaching as professional activity that includes expectations and rewards for leadership functions.[9]

These and other professional orientations to teachers and their work suggest that, on the one hand, the teachers can and should be expected to exert considerable authority on life in classrooms, and, on the other, should also be central participants in the life of the school. This *executive* status alters in many major ways how a school functions. At the classroom level it is assumed that teachers' knowledge and skill, particularly in terms of decision-making about relationships between individuals and groups of students and curriculum requirements, can be exerted with minimal external direction. It assumes that the primary external linkage is with technical and intellectual assistance, to be used at the discretion of the teacher because of his or her deep understanding of the chief elements of the learning situation. Because it assumes that the teacher has been and will continue to be a participant in decisions about evaluation expectations and procedures, the conception of teacher as executive calls for teacher evaluation schemes that question the degree to which the teacher accomplishes those goals that he or she has had a part in determining rather than being rated on whether he or she is responding to the will of others.[10]

We are considerably more knowledgeable than we were a decade or so ago about the uncertainty that is built into the teaching-learning act. Part of our knowledge is rooted in the understanding that, although many classrooms appear to naive observers to be alike, situations are sharply different. Those situational differences require that teachers engage in pedagogy that is very different from 'teaching by the numbers'. When we move beyond that simplistic notion of teaching, the issue of how leadership can support a more advanced conception becomes central.

The Executive Teacher, the Principal and Curriculum Improvement

There is a growing body of research evidence that can give direction to school leaders, principals and teachers, as they create the conditions that support school change, in this instance, curriculum improvement. In contrast to the rather fuzzy notion that principals should be 'facilitators', however that term is defined, recent research has uncovered a number of school variables that can be shaped by a thoughtful school leader such that the school demonstrates conventional effectiveness, most often in the forms of student scores on standardized achievement tests, as well as in less conventional measures of success, in the forms of teachers' morale and beliefs about their own efficacy.

Because it is assumed here that teachers will continue to spend the major portion of their professional time with children and youth, it is also assumed that the school principal is the person who can and should take the responsibility for creating an environment, through the manipulation of critical school variables, that supports meaningful curriculum improvement. This view promotes the conception of the school principal as someone who undertakes the responsibility for ensuring that school conditions promote the activity of curriculum development as a school-level focus and who understands that the typical school-level constraints must be reduced or eliminated for this activity to take on current and future meaning. Most importantly, this view distributes responsibility for the curriculum work across the teacher executive cadre rather than reserving it only for administrators.

Although there is a long history to the commonsense rhetoric that 'involvement promotes ownership' and 'participation guarantees implementation', the instances of these and other slogans taking hold in schools are rare. Most often, teachers are called together to provide advice about textbook selection, for instance, or to develop a curriculum during a summer, work for which they are paid a stipend. It is seldom that the advice can be truly infomative rather than impressionistic, given the sporadic nature of the opportunity, or for the curriculum to take hold in schools, given the practice of its development taking place apart from ongoing school situations. Rather, teachers feel betrayed when their advice is not followed by decision-makers and, alternately, feel annoyed at having another curriculum guide placed on their library shelf or disappointed that other teachers do not use the products of their summer work. Because school principals are equivalently separated from these curriculum ventures, they have little vested interest in moving the curriculum into place or in supporting teachers who are frustrated at advice given but not taken.

If, however, we take the view that curriculum improvement is largely a school-level activity, that it is dependent upon broad and deep participation by professionals in the school, and that it must take into account situational variables, then the roles of the teacher and the principal assume sharply different characteristics. For the purposes of this chapter, particular attention is given here to the school principal's contribution to curriculum improvement.

The Principal and the School Context

We are increasingly aware of the complexity of the school as a human organization, and that awareness has sharpened our understanding of which school variables can be altered toward accomplishing positive ends.[11] Certain context features appear to be particularly relevant to supporting school change and improvement, including curriculum development. These features, furthermore, appear to be ones over which the school principal has some considerable influence. I have selected for inclusion here those features that seem to be conceptually and intuitively realistic in terms of curriculum improvement work in schools.

Teacher Participation in Decision-making

In the conception of teaching as labor, as noted above, it is not only unimportant but probably heretic to consider that teachers should have major participant roles in decision-making about school policy, expectations, practice and evaluation. If, however, the view of teacher as executive is adopted, it flows naturally that the teacher should be a part of the decision-making process, partly because it is natural for executives to be so, but largely because of the knowledge and disposition the teacher can bring to the process. This view adopts the belief that teachers' contributions will enrich and sustain decision-making and the subsequent events and activities that result from it.

When one examines typical elementary and secondary schools, however, one notes that teachers are most often central participants only about decisions in their own classrooms (and often only on the fringes of curricular issues even there), but are seldom major parties to school-level decision-making. It is a common litany among teachers that their voices simply are not heard, that administrative and organizational structures stand between them and opportunities for participation, that they are seldom consulted about major curricular or other alterations in practice, and that in the end they feel more like automatons than professionals. (Recent developments in teacher education, particularly those aimed at new teachers, reinforce a dominant view of teaching as paraprofessional activity, something that can be readily taught, easily learned and quickly remediated if found wanting.)

An imaginative, knowledgeable and thoughtful principal, however, can bring to the teacher cadre for deliberation and decision-making those school-level issues that are considered important at any given time.[12] A typical and long-standing example might be the articulation problems that persist across curricular areas. It is seldom that there is smooth or easy transition from grade to grade or from subject to subject, even when the grades and subjects are contained in the same elementary or secondary school. The principal can bring this issue to the attention of the school faculty at large (rather than let it rest as a point of contention within individual teachers), use it as a focus for thinking together and coordinate the activities and events necessary to its resolution. Rather than dealing in public only with what have come to be termed 'administrivia', such as schedules, bulletins from the central office and the like, the collective professional body

deliberates and makes decisions together about issues of major importance to school success and professional expectation.

Although there have been a number of formulations of the process of participation in schools, an appealing one continues to be Bentzen's dialogue, decision-making, action and evaluation.[13] Using the example of curriculum articulation above, the principal would ensure that there was sufficient time to talk together about both perceptions and technical knowledge regarding problems and prospects (dialogue), would work with teacher colleagues toward tentative resolution of the problem (decision), would support and monitor the implementation of the resolution (action), and engage with the faculty in determining the consequences of their work together (evaluation). Naturally, this sequence is not as neatly observed in practice as it is presented here, but the research base is solid and the intuitive appeal of the process is considerable. Further, it is within the realm of a school principal's authority to create the conditions necessary for its introduction into the school organization.

Time and Schedules

Schools are busy places, and a good deal of the busyness is regulated by how time is spent and by where people are expected to be. Unfortunately, teachers in the typical school in the United States are controlled by time and schedules that, in extraordinarily lockstep and effective fashion, keep them apart from one another, offer little professional relief from practical activity and promote the sense of isolation that has received so much attention and so little resolution. The school as an 'egg crate', a 'cottage industry' and a '2 by 4 by 6' environment will do little to promote widespread curriculum improvement.

There are time and schedule dimensions of school life that principals can orchestrate to bring about the time and space opportunities for the participatory decision-making noted above.[14] Most teachers have as part of the contractual agreements with school systems one or more professional periods each day, time that is expected to be devoted to professional activity. Principals can arrange for these times to coincide for certain groups (for example, teachers in the same subject fields or grade levels) so that opportunities to engage together about curriculum become a reality in the school culture. Principals can act as advocates with district officers to make available professional days for teachers, days in which there can be relatively sustained dialogue. Principals can arrange for substitute teachers so that teachers assigned to the school can observe exemplary curricula in use. Principals can arrange for large-group students events, thereby freeing numbers of teachers to work together toward an improved curriculum.

Interestingly, there are few instances of shifts in time and schedules that can be observed in large numbers of schools. When such shifts are suggested as reasonable ways to create conditions for working on school issues, including curriculum, the problems associated with altering business as usual come to the forefront of attention. Yet in effective schools, schools where important teaching and learning are taking place, such flexibility is, in fact, a new order of business as usual. This flexibility is essential to promoting school-level deliberation and action that are systematic, ongoing and developmental.

Rewards

Although conventional wisdom would have it that teachers' primary preoccupation is with salary, as determined by collective agreements with boards of education, it is increasingly apparent that teachers' conceptions of rewards are considerably more comprehensive and thoughtful than is sometimes believed. Teachers, as is true for most adults in our society, recognize that rewards come in many forms other than the financial.

Rewards for doing well the work of the teacher can be tangible and they can be symbolic.[15] The tangible rewards range from stipends for assuming extra responsibility (a common feature of summer curriculum development work) through access to unconventional or typically unavailable curriculum resources to that most precious of teacher commodities, time. One of the most common teacher litanies is the lack of time to do good work, whether that work is conventional teaching or providing well tested curriculum proposals for consideration by faculty colleagues. Time is eaten away by the bureaucratic nature of schools and the concomitant need to complete a variety of forms and other paperwork. It is also eroded by the dailiness of schooling, exemplified most dramatically by the notion that teachers are not doing the work of teaching unless they are meeting with students. Although thoughtful teachers and administrators know that teaching involves a wide variety of non-instructional tasks such as planning, evaluating, assessing curriculum materials, reflecting upon one's practice, the time to engage in these important activities is too often unavailable in the stereotypical school day and must be squeezed out of teachers' evenings, weekends and vacations.

The principal is in a prime position to study and act upon the issue of time and how it is expected to be spent in schools. As noted above, largely in terms of students, time *is* a manipulable variable, at least the expectations for time use. A principal who adopts a school model that has at its heart teacher participation in decision-making and decision implementation must alter the conditions of the school such that time for these activities is made available in a systematic fashion. Such a principal would use non-instructional persons to complete the myriad paperwork connected to school recordkeeping, would invest in the computer technology required to minimize data storage and retrieval, would experiment with patterns of large- and small-group instruction, would test a number of flexible scheduling patterns, would work toward the institutionalization of a community and/or parent volunteer cadre of school workers and would be an advocate of these time-use patterns in negotiations with school system administrators and policy-makers.

In terms of symbolic rewards schools are remarkably barren in this regard. In the same ways that teachers and the public have come to accept, if not believe fully in, the notion of 'a teacher is a teacher is a teacher', it is also apparent that this dictum has contributed to the absence of symbolic occasions that suggest that some teachers, or most of the teachers in some schools, deserve special recognition for the excellence of their contributions to classrooms and schools. Where are the celebrations of outstanding professional behavior and consequences of that behavior? Where are the recognition points in a teacher's career? Where do teachers who provide curriculum leadership, for example, receive their emotional and intellectual sustenance for continuing to lead?

Only recently, and in connection with various plans for teacher career ladder schemes, have we seen any serious attention paid to systematic celebration of teachers' important

work.[16] The school principal, because of proximity and ongoing opportunities to observe and participate with teachers in a building, has ample opportunity to engage in symbolic rewarding behavior. This might include such minor events as making sure that all teachers in a school are aware of the school-level leadership of a few. This can be done publicly and systematically in both print and oral forms. It might also include making opportunities available for teachers to publish in local or national outlets the products of their curriculum work. It might also include the designation of teacher leaders, relatively independent of principal interaction, who are in full charge of important school functions. (This last is seen by some as yet another way to coerce teachers into doing the work of the principal. What is not recognized in this perception is that a conception of teaching as professional activity, executive decision-making, also calls for teacher leadership. Professional teachers are eager to assume that leadership, providing, of course, that it does not turn into yet another set of hollow or pro forma ploys to increase involvement without expectations for real accomplishment.)

Staff Stability

Curriculum improvement is an ongoing, developmental activity. It requires reasoned deliberation, testing of ideas in small- and large-scale ways, a thorough understanding of the institution, the growth of technical and conceptual skill and understanding, and a continually deepening sensitivity to what is working and what may need adaptation or dramatic revision. These elements of curriculum work can seldom, if ever, be accomplished in a school environment that is characterized by a revolving door policy or practice, an uncertainty about which teachers will be there for the next year or, as is true in some especially difficult schools, even who will be there next month.[17]

The principal can be the key to staff stability. This stability is partly the consequence of the principal having a clear vision of what the school is all about, the school's mission, if you will. This expectation can guide the selection of faculty, can provide absolutely essential bases for working with those faculty over time, and can give a teacher candidate the understanding necessary to make a decision to join or not to join the school. Except in rare cases where faculty appointments are the responsibility of teachers already in the school, the principal is the person who has both the most contact with prospective teachers for the school and the decision-making responsibility to accept and reject from the pool of candidates.

Although it has been widely believed that the principal sets the general 'tone' of a school, it is only recently that we have become aware of how this complex set of actions has an impact on staffing. Teachers will travel many miles each day, seek out and work in schools that have the reputation for being difficult and go well beyond conventional expectations for performance in schools where the principal has demonstrated sensitive and strong leadership.[18] (Somewhat counter to the argument for stability but important in terms of aggregating the most effective faculty group, outstanding principals are known to be successful in ensuring that teachers who somehow do not fit the school's mission find other places to teach, even within the constraints of system or union rules and regulations.)

Much of the content of this chapter provides the background against which staff

stability is attained and maintained, and the principal is the key agent in realizing these participatory norms and, ultimately, in guaranteeing staff stability for curricular and other school improvement goals.

Professional Collegiality

An attribute of effective school organizations is that there is a professional atmosphere, a shared understanding that the members are there because of their expectation that they will accomplish the purposes of the organization.[19] This is sharply different from, although not completely contradictory to, a sense of social and personal well-being where people enjoy one another's company because of some non-professional affinity.

The principal is a particularly important figure in establishing and sustaining collegial norms that focus on professional activity, interactions and productivity. He or she can contribute to the school's more social dimensions as well, but an essential element in making schools work is giving continuous attention to the norm of professional collegiality. This attention is directed toward making certain that the preoccupations of educators in the schools are with the tasks of teaching and schooling, that teacher time is spent well in accomplishing those tasks and that there are ample opportunities for both formal and informal deliberation around schooling issues, possibilities and dilemmas.

Curriculum improvement provides an ideal focus for professional collegiality. It brings to the forefront of attention of the partners in the schooling enterprise the content and nature of instruction. It provides a natural forum for deliberations across subject-matter boundaries and age-level assignments. It calls into question the human resources that can be discovered or developed in the school to bring about desired changes in students' behavior. It is a pervasive and deep-seated element of the school culture.[20]

The principal who uses the curriculum as the object of attention, in short, has the opportunity to infuse the school environment with occasions where professional collegiality can be called forth, systematically demonstrated over time and rewarded. The presence of a professional collegial norm in the school is probably as predictive of school success as any other variable that can be acted upon by a principal.

Linkage with Technical Assistance

It is tempting to believe, in the face of incredible odds against it, that teachers are well connected with the knowledge and skill required not only to do the work of teaching well but to gain ever more effective control over teaching throughout a career. Unfortunately, such appears not to be the case. Teachers, quite justifiably, are often very insecure in their command over their work and, equally justifiably, resentful of school systems' provision of what are often seen as trivial or meaningless opportunities to grow and develop professionally. The repetition of so-called 'in-service days' during which little if anything is learned, the provision of workshops as independent events unconnected to a broad vision of what teaching is, the in-one-day-and-out-the-next visits of so-called experts are quite rightly disdained by teachers as impositions upon their valuable time and energy and as

expressions of low expectations for their competence and sense of professional purpose.

A school principal who cares deeply about the work of the school and who respects teachers as growing professionals will, on the one hand, recognize that teachers, even in the best of circumstances, are often isolated from intellectual stimulation and, on the other hand, work to open up windows of opportunity such that the stimulation can occur.[21] He or she will make available new ideas on a regular and sustained basis, ideas that are not presented as prescriptions for practice but for dialogue and deliberation, perhaps even debate. There will not be a sequence of fads of the moment but there will be attention given over time to intellectually and practically sound propositions for alternation of practice. Probably as a consequence of participatory decision-making, these propositions will be selected because of their natural relationship to the shifting priorities of the school.

Perhaps in no school arena is it more important to have sustained linkage with technical assistance than in curriculum improvement. Because of the historical dependence upon textbooks for curriculum knowledge and process, teachers are seldom as thoroughly understanding of the complexity of the curriculum development process as is needed for meaningful change to take place. Too often, teachers are exposed only to curriculum planning as a day-to-day event, not as a flow of decisions over periods of months and years.[22] Schools, departments and colleges of education tend to reserve for graduate programs any deep exploration and understanding of various paradigms of curriculum discourse. (This, of course, fits the teacher-as-worker conception in that it withholds from teacher preparation programs the knowledge and skill believed to be important only for the designated authorities in the system, that is, administrators and supervisors.)

The principal who wants to work with teachers toward curriculum change will need to take very seriously the issue of how the school's capacity for planning and implementing change can be increased. In some cases technical assistance can be secured from the central office of the school system. But, if the other content of this chapter is taken to heart, the primary purpose of this relationship will be to transfer the knowledge to the school on a permanent basis, implying the need to help one or more teachers become the school-level equivalent of the central office curriculum expert.

Teacher Evaluation

One of the most powerful context variables that is subject to principal influence is the evaluation of teachers. Unfortunately, teacher evaluation is often fragmented, lacking in specific focus and considered by teachers and administrators alike more of an interruption in the business of schooling than as a valued instrument of the school culture. It is more typical of teacher evaluation for it to be seldom practised than for it to be a systematic and ongoing feature of the school. New teachers, as a consequence of local and sometimes state regulations, are evaluated more frequently than experienced teachers, many of whom report never being evaluated by their building-level administrators.

Although it may be conventional wisdom that teacher evaluation is a process fraught with anxiety and antagonism between the primary participants, such need not be the case. Teachers, new and experienced, report that, under fair and well understood conditions, evaluation practices provide a valuable focus for continuing to learn to teach and for

understanding their contributions to the school.[23] Rather than resenting evaluation, teachers in general consider it very useful to have a mirror against which to measure their own effectiveness and their perceptions about the consequences of their work. (Naturally, when teacher evaluation appears to be capricious, unconnected to a public understanding of what is valued in teaching and driven by favoritism rather than fairness, evaluation is perceived to be a negative influence in a school.)

The evaluation of teachers can be an important aspect of promoting teacher growth generally, and of focusing on curriculum work specifically. If the norms of a school, as demonstrated by its mission and its decision-making structure, are centrally concerned with improving the curriculum, the teacher evaluation scheme can include that dimension directly. Too often, teacher evaluation procedures examine only the most stereotypical of teacher behavior, interactions with students. Although these interactions make up the heart of teaching activity, it is well known that teachers' work extends well beyond 'meeting with students'. In the most effective schools teachers are constantly involved in the goal-setting and decision-making components of school life (see above). It is reasonable to assume that a signficant number of goals and decisions are directly associated with the school curriculum, in terms of planning, implementation and evaluation. If such is the case, it is also reasonable to assume that the evaluation of teachers will give considerable emphasis to the teacher's contribution to the school's curriculum enterprise.

Whether for an inexperienced or veteran teacher, it is useful to know how one's work is perceived by one's chief administrator. This knowledge helps to shape decisions about altering the amount and/or quality of that work as well as to provide information about whether one wishes to remain in a given school. After all, it is certainly possible that a teacher's particular view of schooling or perspective on appropriate pedagogy may not 'fit' certain school cultures. This can be revealed in positive as well as negative ways by participation in a well conceptualized and appropriately conducted evaluation system. If the evaluation procedures focus upon contribution to curriculum improvement and experimentation as a valued aspect of teacher behavior, and a teacher does not believe that this kind of contribution is a worthwhile competitor for other teacher activities, there is the possibility for either renegotiated expectations or relocation.

Teacher evaluation, then, can support the development and maintenance of school norms related to participation in curriculum work as a consequence of making public expectations for this participation as well as providing ongoing and systematic data regarding its degree of presence. Further, teacher evaluation data can be used as important decision information about necessary and desirable professional development opportunities for teachers and administrators.

Professional Growth Opportunities

A building-level administrator has explicit responsibility for ensuring that teachers are provided access to and opportunities for professional growth.[24] (This, of course, is also an organizational responsibility of the school system as a whole.) The intensity that the principal brings to this important function, as well as the discrimination regarding its

focus, can influence significantly not just the teachers as individual professionals but the school as a social organization.

The recent past has demonstrated the tendency for professional growth to be conceptualized as remediation and be firmly embedded in issues of minimum competence. This stance has resulted in putting in place procedures that reflect a deficit model of typical in-service education, a means less to guarantee excellence than to be certain that teachers do as little harm as possible.[25] It is intuitively appealing to believe that professional growth opportunities, to be influential upon teachers and upon the workplace, should be pointed toward ambitious rather than minimal goals. At issue for the purpose of this chapter is how to bring together the expectations for staff development as a school convention, the processes of staff development as institutional practices and the content of staff development as the coherent focus for the processes.

Recent research has identified a set of staff development program variables that are consistently associated with successful outcomes.[26] These variables are particularly well suited to curriculum improvement in that they accommodate to a high degree the complexity of curriculum work. They can also be manipulated by a school principal through acting upon many of the issues noted already in this chapter.

The variables associated with successful professional development programs are (1) *context-sensitivity* (giving careful attention to curriculum improvement in relation to the nature of a particular school); (2) *knowledge-based* (using appropriate research, theory, proposition and values in deciding curriculum issues); (3) *ongoing* (recognizing that curriculum work is cumulative over time); (4) *developmental* (ensuring that the curriculum work is not just a set of independent events but, instead, is a consequence of logical and intellectually sound relationships among components); (5) *participatory and collaborative* (involving most, if not all, of the school's professional staff in curriculum improvement activities); (6) *purposeful* (basing the curriculum development firmly in well articulated and public expectations for learning); and (7) *analytic and reflective* (providing frequent opportunities for participants to think together about their work and to make adjustments as a result of their deliberations).

These staff development program features can be influenced greatly by the manner in which a school principal provides professional growth opportunities for teachers (and, indeed, for school administrators including the principal himself or herself). They also match conceptually the picture of the school culture that is presented in this chapter. Importantly, they are amenable to manipulation by the principal as he or she works with teachers toward consideration, alteration, improvement and assessment of a school's curriculum.

Summary

The view of curriculum work as a schoolwide activity and how that activity can be influenced by building-level administrators has provided the content of this section. This conception of the school as an organization, however, is dependent in large measure upon a reconceptualization of the role of the teacher, a shift from believing and acting as if the

teacher is a worker, guided in large part by administrative decisions, to considering the teacher as a school-level executive and professional colleague. This move toward executive status for teachers suggests that principals must involve teachers systematically in school decisions, consider them as partners in program and curriculum planning and implementation, focus evaluation goals and processes on the degree to which the teachers function as participating executive professionals, and identify the school culture variables that must be in place for the vision to be accomplished.

The Dilemma of the Professional Preparation of Principals

The description of the principal as an organizational architect who works primarily on the creation of context conditions that will support curriculum improvement has taken up the bulk of this chapter. This view is validated by research evidence, has intuitive appeal and is conceptually relevant to thinking of schools as human organizations. Further, this view is consonant with conceptions of curriculum work in regard to complexity, the need for multiple human resources, the requirements of continuity over time and the belief that the closer one is to the student and teacher populations, the more meaningful the curriculum implementation will be.

Unfortunately, this picture of the school principal is seldom reflected in programs designed to prepare people to assume a school administrator role. Typically, a graduate program for principal preparation gives serious attention only to conventional administrative objects of study. A prospective principal usually will be exposed to courses in school law, finance, management techniques, personnel issues and the like. There might be some attention to teacher supervision and the inclusion of a requirement for a school-based internship of approximately a semester. Seldom is there any systematic and serious study of curriculum or of pedagogy. As problematic, from the perspective taken in this chapter, is the relative absence across graduate programs of disciplined attention to the context variables in schools that have been shown to be influential upon school success, whether success in the form of curriculum improvement or some other valued school activity.

The end result of such principal preparation programs is that school principals are most often unaware of the influence they could have on the school culture and overly dependent upon prescriptions for practice that are firmly based in conventional perceptions of administrative competence. The dominant pattern of school leadership appears to be managerial. Although there are definite aspects of schooling that require skill in management, dependence upon a management orientation for bringing about school improvement, curricular or otherwise, is more than likely insufficient to the task at hand.

What is required to accomplish the relationships, processes and outcomes described in this chapter is a dramatic shift in how principals are prepared, and, concomitantly, in how the role of the teacher is conceptualized.[27] If teachers are to realize their ambitions for professional status, the work they do and the processes that support that work will be removed from preoccupation with 'teacher as worker'. Professional teachers will assume much greater responsibility for the life of the school, rather than only assume responsibility for life in a classroom. They will be supported in this and helped to be effective only if

building principals have the necessary knowledge and skill to create the contexts for it to happen. Principals will be empowered to be organizational architects largely because of the nature of their preparation.

Principal preparation programs should maintain some measure of preoccupation with conventional topics as noted above. They must also include significantly more attention to curricular issues, paradigms and dilemmas. They must focus on the nature of teaching as professional activity, including the work of teaching that takes place apart from students and individual classrooms. Preparation programs must attend to conceptions of schools as human organizations, ones that are malleable and susceptible to planned change by thoughtful alterations in business as usual. There is sufficient evidence to support this view over one that promotes management orientations as ways to bring about significant changes in educational institutions.

Conclusion

If schools can be reconsidered as places where everyone learns, students and teachers and administrators, and where learning across the community is a valued and supported activity, many of the goals for schooling that have eluded all but a few schools may have greater chance for realization.[28] For this to happen, principals must take far more seriously than is typical the curriculum enterprise as a schoolwide focus for professional interaction. They must understand how they own behavior adds to or detracts from that focus, how they contribute through their manipulation of the environment to the development of norms of professional collegiality, participation in valued activity and investment in the future of the school. Principals, to be successful leaders, must develop the habits of mind and practice that promote interaction over isolation, goal clarity over ambiguity, public rather than private understanding of rewards and sanctions, wise rather than trivial use of time, meaningful rather than incoherent professional development, and linkage with rather than isolation from the assistance that is necessary to engage effectively in schooling.

If we have learned anything during the past two decades of inquiring into schooling practice, we have learned that the power of the school context is extraordinarily strong. We have also learned that the school principal is a primary influence on the school context. This knowledge should be used to support curriculum improvement as a central function of professional educators in schools.

Notes

1 John I. Goodlad, 'The School as a Workplace,' in *Staff Development: Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, Part 2, ed. Gary A. Griffin (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 36–61.

2 Susan J. Rosenholtz and Otto Bassler, *Organizational Conditions of Teacher Learning*, Interim Report to the National Institute of Education, Grant # NIE-G-83-0041, 1983, unpublished manuscript.

3 Talcott Parsons, 'General Theory in Sociology,' in *Sociology Today*, ed. Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (New York: Basic Books, 1959), pp. 3–38.

4 I am grateful to David Berliner who coined this insightful title for the teacher who engages systematically in executive decision-making in the complex environment of the classroom. This conception, although not so named, also guided the selection of guidelines contained in Gary A. Griffin and Phillip S. Schlechty, 'Recommendations to the Mississippi Department of Education,' unpublished manuscript, 1984.

5 Gary A. Griffin and Louise L. Light, *Nutrition Education Curricula: Relevance, Design, and the Problem of Change* (Paris: UNESCO, 1975).

6 Judith Schwartz, 'Teacher Directed In-Service: A Model That Works,' *Teachers College Record*, 86 (Fall 1984): 223–49.

7 Susan J. Rosenholtz, Otto Bassler and Kathy Hoover-Dempsey, *Elementary School Organization and the Construction of Shared Reality*, Interim Report to the National Institute of Education, Grant # NIE-G-83-0041, 1983, unpublished manuscript.

8 At the inaugural meeting of the Holmes Group in Washington, D.C. on 30 January-1 February 1987 Albert Shanker and Mary Hatwood Futrell presented a set of views regarding teachers' views of their workplaces that questioned seriously the degree to which schools could improve as a consequence of more rigorous preparation of teachers if the schools where they eventually do their teaching do not become more receptive environments for truly professional practice.

9 Holmes Group, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, 1986); Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1986).

10 Arthur Wise, Linda Darling-Hammond, Milbrey McLaughlin and H.T. Bernstein, *Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices* (Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1984).

11 Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller, 'School Improvement: Themes and Variations,' *Teachers College Record* 86 (Fall 1984): 4–19.

12 Judith Warren Little, 'Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions of School Success,' *American Educational Research Journal*, 19 (Fall 1982): 325–40.

13 M. Maxine Bentzen, *Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principle* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), pp. 77–108.

14 Judith Warren Little, 'Professional Development in Schools,' address to the Chicago Area School Effectiveness Council, Chicago, 10 February 1987.

15 Phillip C. Schlechty and Ann Walker Joslin, 'Images of Schools,' *Teachers College Record*, 86 (Fall 1984): 156–70.

16 *ibid.*

17 Susan J. Rosenholtz, (1989) 'Workplace Conditions of Teacher Quality and Commitment: Implications for the Design of Teacher Induction Programs,' in Gary A. Griffin and Suzanne Millies (eds), *The Initial Years of Teaching: Background Papers and Recommendations*, (Chicago, IL.: University of Illinois at Chicago,).

18 Beatrice A. Ward, 'Professional Development of Teachers and School Effectiveness,' address to the Chicago Area School Effectiveness Council, Chicago, 9 May 1986.

19 Judith Warren Little, *School Success and Staff Development: The Role of Staff Development in Urban Desegregated Schools* (Boulder, CO: Center for Action Research, 1981).

20 A major curriculum and staff development effort took place in the Yonkers (NY) Public Schools during the period 1978–83. At first conceived as primarily curriculum development, the work took on the character of a systemwide school improvement strategy as large numbers of teachers participated directly as curriculum writers and less directly as both critics and experimenters as pieces of the new K-12 curriculum became available. The implementation of the new curriculum became the focus of staff development activities for all teachers in the system. In this example the opportunities for making signficant changes in schooling appeared to be the consequence of the

complex and continuous interactions between curriculum development and professional growth activities.

21 See, for example, Gary A. Griffin and Susan Barnes, 'Using Research Findings to Change School and Classroom Practices: Results of an Experimental Study,' *American Educational Research Journal*, 23 (Winter 1986): 572–86.

22 Gary A. Griffin, *Student Teaching and the Commonplaces of Schooling* (Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin, 1983).

23 Linda Darling-Hammond, 'A Proposal for Evaluation in the Teaching Profession,' *Elementary School Journal*, 86 (March 1986): 531–52.

24 Griffin and Barnes, 'Using Research Findings to Change School and Classroom Practices,' *op. cit.*

25 Examples of the use of minimum standards to guide how teachers are judged can be found in several of the new state-level teacher programs. The consequences of this perspective about teachers seem to be a lowering of expectations, not only by those charged with evaluating teacher competence but by the new teachers themselves. This is discussed in Gary A. Griffin, 'The Paraprofessionalization of Teaching,' Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1985.

26 These features were the result of extensive reanalyses of three large-scale studies of teacher education programs. It was found that the successful instances of professional development strategies included these features in interaction. The model that emerged and hypothetical descriptions of how it might appear in practice are found in James V. Hoffman and Sara A. Edwards (eds), *Reality and Reform in Clinical Teacher Education* (New York: Random House, 1986).

27 An extremely thoughtful picture of the dilemmas and rewards of being a school principal is found in R. Bruce McPherson, Robert L. Crowson and Nancy J. Pitner, *Managing Uncertainty: Administrative Theory and Practice in Education* (Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill, 1986).

28 Susan Rosenholtz reports that in the relatively ineffective schools in her sample teachers report that it takes approximately one and a half years to learn to teach. In modestly effective schools teachers report that it takes about five years to learn to teach. In the most effective schools teachers report that one never learns how to teach because becoming a teacher is a continuous process. There appears to be a strong relationship between good schools and the context feature of a community of learning.

Chapter 11

Staff Development and School Change*

Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin and David D. Marsh

The desultory status of staff development as education's neglected stepchild is changing. Until recently there was little interest in the professional development of experienced teachers. Teacher training institutions were preoccupied with pre-service education and local school districts were struggling to accommodate burgeoning student enrollments and build new schools. But now issues related to staff development have moved to center stage. One reason for the new status of staff development is the recognition that many of the 'Great Society' education reform efforts fell short primarily because planners seriously underestimated teacher training needs. In retrospect it was unrealistic to expect that classroom teachers could bring about significant change in the services provided to such special student groups as the disadvantaged and the bilingual without substantial in-service education. In the absence of such training it is not surprising that the result of many reform efforts was, disappointingly, more of the same. An important lesson of the so-called 'Decade of Reform' (1965–75) is that even the 'best' educational practice is unlikely to fulfill its promise in the hands of an inadequately trained or unmotivated teacher. We have learned that the problem of reform or change is more a function of people and organizations than of technology.

A second reason for the current interest in staff development is that the unprecedented growth of the 1970s has been followed by an equally dramatic decline in pupil enrollment. The market for new teachers is practically non-existent and — for the first time in many years — local school districts find themselves with a stable, and tenured, staff. Thus teacher training institutions are confronted with the need to move from a focus on pre-service education; local school districts can no longer rely on 'new hires' to bring fresh ideas into district classrooms and must face the problem of how to upgrade the skills of the teachers they already have.

However, the only consensus that appears to exist about staff development is that what we have now is ineffective and a waste of time. The general feeling is that most staff development programs have benefited neither teachers nor students. If effective staff development is not an isolated workshop or an evening extension course, what is it?

* This chapter was published originally in Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller (eds), *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1979), pp. 69–94.

Rand's study of federal programs supporting educational change looked closely at the local process of change — and at the factors that support teacher growth.[1] The Change Agent study deals with a number of issues that are central to the design and implementation of staff development programs: for example, what motivates teachers to acquire new skills? What helps teachers to retain these skills? What can the principal do to support and sustain teacher change? What is the role of the central administration in the efforts of classroom teachers to improve their practices? This chapter draws on the Rand Change Agent study to suggest issues that will be central to rethinking both the nature and the role of staff development programs.

The Rand Findings

The Rand study examines staff development in the context of broader changes in schools associated with various types of federally funded projects. The study is rich in implications for in-service education for several reasons. The study used 'outcome' measures that correspond directly to the anticipated results of in-service education. These outcomes include change in teacher practices, pupil growth and the retention of teacher change in the form of continued use of project methods and materials following termination of federal funds. The study also included many of the process variables considered in in-service education such as teacher commitment and involvement, staff reward structures, skills training and classroom follow-up and the role of the principal or school climate in teacher growth and the maintenance of change. Finally, in the view of the study's respondents 'successful change' and 'staff development' were essentially synonymous.

The Change Agent study identified four clusters of broad factors as crucial to the successful implementation and continuation of local change efforts: *institutional motivation, project implementation strategies; institutional leadership*, and certain *teacher characteristics*. This section will discuss each of these clusters of factors and examine its relationship to the extent of project goals achieved, the extent of teacher change, the extent of student growth and the continued use of teacher methods and materials following termination of federal funds.[2]

Institutional Motivation

Institutional motivation is the first cluster of factors that the study found to be critical to project outcomes. A school district may undertake a special project, and a school or teacher may agree to participate in the project, for very different reasons. A district may initiate a change agent project to address a high priority need — or it may start a project to ameliorate community pressures, to appear 'up-to-date', or simply because the money is there. Similarly, teachers participate in a special project effort because they are 'told to', because it is their own idea, because of collegial pressure, or because they see the project as an opportunity for important professional growth. The institutional motivations that characterize a planned change effort significantly influence both project implementation

and the extent to which project methods and strategies are eventually incorporated into regular school or district practice.

Not surprisingly, the commitment of project teachers is very important. The Rand Change Agent study found that teacher commitment had the most consistently positive relationship to all the project outcomes (e.g., percentage of project goals achieved, change in teachers, change in student performance, continuation of project methods and materials). The importance of teacher commitment to the achievement of project goals is axiomatic: project success is unlikely unless teachers want to work hard to make it happen.

Though few disagree that teacher commitment is a necessary ingredient to project success, there is debate about the extent to which the commitment of teachers can be affected by policies or program strategies. A number of practitioners and planners — perhaps turned somewhat cynical by a parade of disappointing change efforts — have come to believe that teacher commitment is essentially 'immutable': some teachers are eager to change and learn new practices, and some simply are not. The policy implications of such a perspective are discouraging — that is, efforts to improve educational practice should be limited to those teachers who evidence strong initial interest and motivation. The Change Agent study suggests a much less deterministic view. Both the fieldwork and the survey analysis suggest that teacher commitment is influenced by at least three factors: the motivation of district managers, project planning strategies, and the scope of the proposed change agent project. How does each of these factors affect teachers commitment?

Motivation of District Managers

The attitudes of district administration about a planned change effort were a 'signal' to teachers as to how seriously they should take a special project. The fieldwork offers numerous examples of teachers — many of whom supported the project goals — who decided not to put in the necessary extra effort simply because they did not feel that district administrators were interested. In the absence of explicit district support for their efforts many teachers felt that the personal costs associated with a change effort were not in their professional self-interest and were unlikely to make a difference in the long run. Consequently, few of the projects that were initiated by the district primarily for opportunistic or political reasons were effectively implemented; none was officially continued after the end of federal funding. As one respondent put it. 'The superintendent had better believe in the project — give it his personal backing and support. Teacher confidence is essential; teachers should see in the beginning that top administration believe [in the project] and are committed to it.'

The Change Agent study further suggests that administrative support must be generated at the outset. Given the multiple demands facing district administrators, local project planners cannot expect to secure this interest and backing once the project activities are under way. But even were this possible, the initial disinterest of the district leadership is likely to leave a negative legacy upon the commitment and attitudes of project teachers.

Project Planning Strategies

The commitment of both district administrators and teachers was also influenced by the way the project was planned initially. Four general patterns of project planning

characterized change agent projects and had very different implications for staff commitment and project outcomes. One could be called a 'top-down' strategy: project plans were made almost entirely in the central office and announced to would-be implementors. A second pattern, 'grass-roots planning', was just the opposite: plans were devised by teachers or school-based project staff with little involvement of district administrators. A third planning strategy was one of essentially 'no planning': a project plan and project funds were imported into the district with little or no involvement from district staff at any level. 'Collaborative planning' characterized the fourth general planning strategy. In this mode project plans were made with equal input from teachers and district managers. Although this style was rarely characterized by conscious notions of 'parity', participants at all levels in the system were treated as partners in the process of planning for a special project effort. Of these four planning strategies, a collaborative planning style was necessary to both the short-term and long-term success of a planned change effort.

Top-down planning strategies typically resulted in indifferent implementation and spotty continuation even when district officials were committed to project goals and serious about the change effort. Top-down planning usually met with indifference or resistance from the school staff. Teachers felt that such projects were not 'theirs' but the central administrators' and had little personal investment in project objectives or success.

Top-down planning strategies often resulted in disappointing projects for another reason: central office staff were insufficiently aware of the needs and practices of particular schools, classrooms and teachers. One teacher made this revealing comment:

> This project hasn't worked out and its main effect has been to cause a close, well-organized faculty to turn to distrust each other. This was the result of forcing a program on a school, using an outside coordinator unfamiliar with the school and faculty, and not having the full support of teachers. I personally felt the project ideas were good and could have worked if the teachers in our school had been involved in the planning.

Another teacher in an unsuccessful project complained. 'The project was planned and designed without the knowledge and consent of the teachers at the school . . . the planner had hardly ever been to our school.' Top-down planning generally fails even with the best of intentions both because it cannot generate the staff commitment necessary to project success and because this planning style does not incorporate the special knowledge and suggestions of the staff who will be responsible for project implementation.

The second planning strategy, grass-roots planning, was only a little more successful. Projects that were conceived and planned at the school level with only cursory review by central office staff often evidenced high initial teacher commitment. But, in the absence of explicit support from district managers, that commitment waned over the course of project implementation. Project teachers found it difficult to sustain initial enthusiasm and motivation when there was little indication that district officials also cared. In the long run grass-roots projects generally disappeared as completely as top-down projects. Though teacher-initiated project practices and methods could be found in isolated pockets of the district, without district support even successful projects withered away because of factors such as staff turnover, indifference or lack of information on the part of building principals.

Only the fourth (and more time-consuming) planning strategy, collaborative planning, generated the *broad-based* institutional support necessary to effective implementation and to the continuation successful practices. Projects adopting this planning style actively engaged both teaching and administrative staff from the pre-proposal period through implementation, thereby gaining consensus and support from teachers, principals and central office personnel. Evidence of the Change Agent study on this point gives the lie to the conventional wisdom that teacher-initiated projects are usually more successful than are those conceived downtown. 'Who' originated a project did not matter. For example, teacher change and the continuation of project strategies were not significantly different in schools that had originated the project from what they were in schools that had been asked to participate. What did matter was 'how' project planning was carried out, regardless of the source of the idea.

Scope of Change

A third factor that influenced teacher motivation is the scope of change proposed by a project. The Rand study found that the more effort required of project teachers, and the greater the overall change in teaching style attempted by the project, the higher the proportion of committed teachers. Complex and ambitious projects were more likely to elicit the enthusiasm of teachers than were routine and limited projects. The reason for this, we believe, is that ambitious projects appeal to a teacher's sense of professionalism. Evidence from the Change Agent study indicates that a primary motivation for teachers to take on the extra work and other personal costs of attempting change is the belief that they will become better teachers and their students will benefit. Fieldwork observation and interviews with practitioners suggest that the educational promise of an innovation and the apparent opportunity for professional growth are crucial factors in generating teacher commitment.

The importance of professionalism, or intrinsic motivation, to teacher motivation (and thus to project success) raises questions about the utility of extrinsic rewards as a project strategy. Many groups have proposed extrinsic rewards — credit on the district salary scale, extra pay and so on — as possible solutions to the 'problem' of teacher motivation. Although the Change Agent study did not consider this issue comprehensively, it did examine the effects of extra pay for attending staff training sessions. Sometimes this strategy was used 'to get the teachers to go along' with a project, or to 'sweeten the pill'. Teachers who received extra pay for training (about 60 per cent of the sample) were *less* likely than others to report a high percentage of project goals achieved. These teachers also reported *less* improvement in student performance, especially academic performance, than did other teachers in the study.

These findings support the idea that instrinsic professional rewards — such as those implicit in the proposed scope of change — are far more important in motivating teachers. Some project directors commented that although the teachers appreciated the extra pay, the pay alone did not induce teachers to work hard to learn new skills if professional motivation was absent. As one teacher remarked, 'I'll go [to the training session], and I'll collect my $30, but I don't have to listen.'

220

Project Implementation Strategies

The second critical factor affecting the outcomes of local change efforts was the project implementation strategy. Among the most important choices made during the initial planning period were those about how to put the project into practice. Local planners had considerable discretion in selecting project implementation strategies. For example, similar reading projects utilized very different staff training strategies and project governance procedures. The most important of those local choices were those that determined the ways in which the school staff would be assisted in acquiring the new skills and information necessary to project implementation — staff development strategies.

Project strategies that fostered staff learning and change had two complementary elements: (1) *staff training activities*; and (2) *training support activities*. The study found that well conducted staff training and staff training support activities improved project implementation, promoted student gains, fostered teacher change and enhanced the continuation of project methods and materials. These training and support variables alone accounted for a substantial portion of the variation in project success and continuation.

This in itself is not a surprising finding. After all, teachers have to acquire new skills or behavior if project-related changes are to influence student performance and if project strategies are to be continued. But the very different contributions may be these two activities — staff training and support activities — furnish important insights for staff development planners.

Staff Training

Staff training activities were typically skill-specific — instruction in how to carry out a new reading program or introduction to new mathematics materials, for example. As such, this component of a project's implementation strategy corresponds most directly to the traditional focus of many in-service teacher education efforts. Skill training usually involved project workshops, and could occur prior to project implementation, during the first year of project operation or after the first year. By themselves, staff training activities had strong, positive effects on the percentage of project goals achieved, and on student performance in the areas of both achievement and behavior. However, skill-specific training had only a small and not significant effect on teacher change and on the continuation of project methods and materials. In other words, skill-specific training alone influenced student gains and project implementation *only in the short run*.

This finding is puzzling at first glance. After all, if staff training activities significantly and positively affected student performance during the period of project operation, why didn't this effect continue after special funding was terminated? The Change Agent study results suggest a straightforward explanation for this apparent anomaly. Skill-specific training activities only have transient effect because, by themselves, *they do not support staff learning and teacher change*. Skill-specific training enabled teachers to implement new project methods and materials under the aegis of special project operation. But this implementation was often mechanistic and did not necessarily constitute teacher assimilation of the new techniques and procedures. Thus, when the supports of the funded project operation were removed, teachers discontinued using the practices that apparently

enhanced student performance because they had never really learned them in the first place. Skill-specific training, in short, can affect project implementation and student outcomes, but it does not affect the longer-term project outcomes of teacher change and continuation. Staff support activities are necessary to sustain the gains of how-to-do-it training.

Staff-Support Activities

Projects pursued a number of activities to support teacher assimilation of the skills and information delivered in training sessions. In particular, the study examined the contribution of classroom assistance by resource personnel, the use of outside consultants, project meetings and teacher participation in project decisions. Taken together as a support strategy, these activities (when they were seen as useful by the school staff) had a major positive effect — as did staff training — on the percentage of project goals achieved and on student performance. But in contrast to staff training activities, these support activities also had strong positive and direct effects on the longer-term project outcomes — teacher change and continuation of project methods and materials. Well conducted staff support activities not only reinforce the contribution of staff training, but they also make their own important contribution to promoting teacher change and to supporting staff assimilation of project practices.

Training is essentially an information transfer — providing teachers with necessary techniques. But, as the first phase of this study found, the process of implementation is a process of *mutual adaptation* in which teachers modify their practices to conform to project requirements and project technologies are adapted to the day-to-day realities of the school and classroom. Staff support activities, in particular classroom assistance from resource personnel and project meetings, can provide the feedback project staff need to make these modifications. Through these support activities, skill-specific training can be 'individualized' for project teachers in terms of timing and content modification.

Staff support activities can also aid teachers in understanding and applying complex new strategies in ways that standard training — in terms of both form and content — usually cannot do effectively. For example, even a carefully planned staff training program usually cannot anticipate the nature or the timing of project staff assistance requirements, especially as they relate to particular classroom problems. Likewise, staff often cannot perceive what they need to know until the need arises. For both reasons the needs of project staff are not always predictable or synchronized with scheduled training sessions. The utilization of local resource personnel or consultants to provide 'online' assistance can help remedy these inevitable deficiencies. However, it is important to note that the *quality* of this assistance is critical. The study found that the *amount* of classroom assistance from local resource personnel did not matter when teachers perceived their help as useful or very useful. But the frequency of classroom visits did have an effect when it was *not* perceived as helpful. Numerous visits to the classroom by district or project staff were counterproductive when teachers did not feel they were being helped. This assistance actually interfered with project implementation.

Similarly, it was better for projects to use no outside consultants than to use poor ones — and much better than to use poor ones often. Good consultants helped by providing

concrete practical advice to project teachers — showing them how to adapt project methods or materials to their own situation. Good consultants assisted teachers in learning how to solve problems for themselves, rather than by solving problems for them. Ineffective consultants often furnished advice that was too abstract to be useful. In making a recommendation for improving project implementation, one teacher advised, 'Be sure consultants know [the project] goals and some specific things to tell the teachers and not a lot of worthless generalizations and theory.' Another teacher remarked, 'I found most [of the consultants] to be completely lacking in their exposure to, familiarity with, and willingness to come in and work with young children. Many were good philosophically, but not practically, in the day-to-day approach and follow-up.'

Ironically, even 'good' consultants diminished project outcomes in some cases. Consultants often unintentionally pre-empted staff learning opportunities and prevented teachers from learning to implement project strategies for themsleves. One superintendent attributed the failure of a project to this factor: 'The first year, teachers came in from other communities and worked with our teachers. The following year, our teachers were alone and it was impossible to fully implement the program.' The negative effects of consultants that appear in the Change Agent data can be interpreted as a result of both too little and too much help from consultants.

Frequent project meetings were another support strategy that aided teacher efforts to adapt project precepts to their classrooms and assimilate new strategies. Project meetings provided a forum whereby teachers could learn from one another's experience. Project meetings also supported the affective needs of teachers as they attempted to implement change. As one teacher commented, 'Regular monthly meetings are absolutely critical for reinforcement and building interpersonal relationships for co-workers.' However, like consultants and classroom assistance, if meetings were not perceived as useful, they had a detrimental effect on project operations. Frequent meetings that were not judged useful by teachers were strongly associated with less successful projects in the survey sample. The fieldwork suggested that meetings were unproductive when they dwelled primarily on details of project administration and record-keeping and rarely included opportunities for staff to share their problems and reports on process. Such meetings did little to enhance classroom implementation, and teachers found them irritating.

All of these projects activities to support training — classroom assistance, outside consultants, frequent meetings — contributed to project outcomes in yet another and equally critical way. These support activities were necessary for the development of *clarity* concerning the goals of the project and the implications of project strategies for ongoing classroom practices. It is important to note that clarity was not the same as *programmatic specificity*, nor were these factors necessarily related.

The analysis showed that specificity of goals had a major effect on implementation: the more specific the teachers felt the project goals were, the higher the percentage of goals the project achieved, the greater the student improvement attributed to the project, and the greater the continuation of both project methods and materials. Program planners and grant-makers, hoping to enhance special project outcomes, have placed increasing emphasis on the careful specification of project objectives. However, such programmatic specificity is only one component of the broader specificity so important to project success.

Even more important is the second component of specificity — namely, *conceptual clarity*, or the extent to which project staff are clear about what they are to do and understand the rationale underlying project activities.

Programmatic specificity is fundamentally a project design issue and, by itself, does not guarantee staff clarity about project operations. There were many projects in the study in which even clearly stated project objectives made little sense to project staff in terms of their day-to-day responsibilities. Furthermore, programmatic specificity of the type advocated by grant-makers and planners is often not feasible for many ambitious projects, such as projects that focus on change in classroom organization. Conceptual clarity may be fostered — but cannot be assured — by specific project goal statements or by the use of packaged materials or by lectures from outside consultants. The conceptual clarity critical to project success and continuation must be achieved during the process of project implementation — it cannot be 'given' to staff at the outset. Frequent staff meetings and timely classroom assistance by resource personnel are strategies that provide staff with this practical understanding concerning the project goals and methods promulgated in training sessions and project designs.

The effectiveness of both training and training support activities was enhanced by another project implementation strategy: teacher participation in project decision-making. Decisions and choices during implementation would not be necessary if projects were always carried out as originally planned. Most projects, however, particularly successful projects, underwent modification in their initial plans and objectives, and these adaptations were almost always positive improvements.

The strong, positive effect of teacher participation on the percentage of project goals achieved suggests that teacher inputs can significantly improve implementation. Teachers, because of their day-to-day involvement with project operations, are in a much better position than district specialists or even the project director to identify problems and recommend feasible solutions. One elementary school principal advised, 'Give the classroom teacher a strong role in planning any project that he or she is going to be working with. Then listen and change when things do not go as planned on paper.'

Teacher participation in decisions about the project had an important *instrumental* value: teacher suggestions improved the implemented project, and staff participation in reviewing and modifying project procedures significantly enhanced staff clarity. Teacher participation also made an important *affective* contribution to project implementation, namely, development of teachers' 'sense of ownership'.

Institutional Leadership

Institutional leadership is a third important factor for the successful implementation and continuation of a local change project. Indeed, the Change Agent study suggests that project planners need to enlarge their notion of the leadership critical to project outcomes. District planners invest considerable time in identifying competent, enthusiastic leadership for special project efforts, because their concern about leadership typically focuses on the project director. Research underscores the importance of project director leadership to project outcomes. The Change Agent data show that the more effective the project

director (in the view of teachers), the higher the percentage of project goals achieved, and the greater the student improvement observed as a result of the project. An effective project director has significant instrumental value to project implementation: a director's special skills or knowledge can foster staff understanding of project goals and operations, minimize the day-to-day difficulties encountered by classroom teachers, and provide the concrete information staff need to learn during the course of project operations.

The data also indicate, however, that effective project leadership plays only a short-term and circumscribed role in the outcome of local change agent projects. The effectiveness of a project director had no relationship to project continuation or to teacher change. Both the fieldwork and the survey analysis point to other components of school district leadership as critical to these important longer-term project outcomes.

The support and interest of central office staff was, as suggested earlier, very important to staff willingness to work hard to make changes in their teaching practices. Though a skilled and enthusiastic project director may be able effectively to implement a special project in the absence of explicit support from 'downtown', project staff are unlikely to continue using project strategies unless district administrators express interest.

The attitude of the building principal was even more critical to the long-term results of a change agent project. The support of the school principal for a special project was directly related to the likelihood that staff would continue to use project methods and materials after special funding is withdrawn. Furthermore, principal support positively affected project implementation. The Phase II survey asked teachers to indicate the attitude of their principal toward the project. Few of the projects in which the principal was perceived to be unfavorably inclined toward the project scored well on any of the study's outcome measures — percentage of goals achieved, teacher change, student improvement, continuation. Some projects with neutral or indifferent principals scored well, particularly in the percentage of goals achieved, but these projects typically focused on individualized instruction or curriculum revision — activities that could occur almost completely 'behind the classroom door' and in which highly effective directors could compensate for lukewarm principals. Projects having the active support of principals were most likely to succeed, and to be continued.

Why is the principal, not the project director, so important to long-term project outcomes? At the end of federal funding the principal must take a stance toward the project and make a variety of decisions that explicitly or implicitly influence what happens to project methods and materials within the school. In particular, the principal is chiefly responsible for establishing the school's educational policies and philosophy. A project that is in agreement with the school's general operating style would be more likely to be sustained than one that was not. For example, the fieldwork examined an open-classroom project that operated in a very traditional school as part of a district-wide project. Once the umbrella of project authority was removed, the principal made it clear to project teachers in the school that he wished to see their classrooms returned to the traditional pattern; he also strongly discouraged non-project teachers who expressed interest in trying some of the project ideas in their classrooms. In the same district, however, the principal at another school strongly supported the open-classroom approach. After the project ended, this principal encouraged the use of project methods in other classrooms and allocated discretionary money to purchase the necessary materials.

In short, the building principal gives subtle but nonetheless strong messages concerning the 'legitimacy' of continuing project operations in the school — a message that teachers cannot help but receive and interpret in terms of their professional self-interest. Support from the principal is also important to the longevity of special project strategies because of the staff turnover experienced by most schools. If project methods are not to dissipate over time, the principal will have to familiarize new teachers with project concepts and techniques. As one superintendent observed: 'A large turnover in staff [makes it hard to] sustain volunteer activities. If you get a principal who isn't in agreement with project philosophy, it can be difficult to keep a program in a school.'[3]

One way in which principals demonstrated their active support for project activities — as well as gained the information necessary to promote continuation of project strategies — was to participate in project training sessions. Involvement in project training updated their classroom skills and knowledge, and equipped them to lend advice and a sympathetic ear to project teachers. But equally as important, the attendance of principals in project training imparted some important messages to teachers — notably, their personal commitment and their view that the project was a school effort in which everyone was expected to cooperate and work hard. In this way principal attendance at project sessions helped undermine the 'deficit' model that sometimes colors staff training activities and builds resentment of the project as something done 'to' teachers.

In summary, the quality of the leadership available to project staff was critical to the successful implementation and continuation of change agent project efforts. However, it was not enough simply to provide the special project with a skilled and enthusiastic project director. The efforts of even a talented director were likely to be ephemeral unless central office leadership supported the efforts of project staff and unless the school principal activity engaged in project activities. Evidence from the Change Agent study suggests that the task confronting planners in establishing effective leadership for project activities must be construed in broad institutional terms, not in narrow, special project terms.

The study found that the school climate was as important as the principal as an influence on continuation of project methods and materials once federal funding was terminated. The Rand data indicate that good working relationships among teachers enhanced implementation and promoted continuation of project methods and materials. Good working relationships and teacher participation in project decisions were correlated: the development of the one helped the development of the other. In addition, the quality of the school's organizational climate — whether teachers felt their school was a good school to work in, had esprit de corps, was efficient and was managed effectively by the principal — influenced the quality of project relationships. The correlation between participation in project decisions and good staff working relationships draws attention to the implementation strategies chosen for the project; in particular, the influence of the general school climate — a background factor not directly related to project operations — underlines the significance of district site selection. Good project working relationships could develop in 'average' schools when teachers participated in project decisions; conversely, 'good' schools could develop good project working relationships without teacher participation in decisions. However, projects combining a supportive organizational environment with a strategy of teacher participation in project adaptation were most able to implement effectively and continue their innovations.

Teacher Characteristics

The fourth general factor that the Rand study found had major influence on the outcome of planned change efforts is teacher characteristics: the attitudes, abilities and experience teachers bring to a special project effort. A 'conventional wisdom' has developed concerning the effects of various teacher attributes: that older teachers are less willing to change, that the best ideas come from young teachers, that teachers with high verbal ability are more able to achieve gains in student performance and so on. Such beliefs suggest that the personal characteristics of project teachers could have significant import for the outcome of planned change efforts. The study collected information on several teacher attributes most often cited as significantly influencing both student performance and the outcome of innovative projects: age, educational background, verbal ability, years of experience, sense of efficacy.

Three teacher attributes — years of experience, verbal ability, sense of efficacy — had strong and significant, but very different, effects on most of the project outcomes. Specifically, the number of years of teacher experience was *negatively* related to all of the dependent variables, with the exception of teacher continuation of project techniques where there was no relationship. In other words, the more experienced the project teacher, the less likely was the project to achieve its goals, and the less likely was the project to improve student performance.

These relationships in large part are attributable to the fact that the more experienced teachers also were less likely to change their practices as a result of project participation. Moreover, both the fieldwork and the survey analysis suggest that teacher tenure has a curvilinear relationship to project outcomes. That is, teachers seem to 'peak out' after five to seven years of teaching — either maintaining their level of effectiveness (in the best cases) or becoming less effective. For many teachers in the Rand study, the passage of time on the job seemed to diminish their capacity to change and to dampen their enthusiasm for innovations and for teaching. This 'calcifying' effect seemed less an intrinsic characteristic of teachers or of the teaching role than testimony to the way schools are managed and the way professional development activities are provided for staff.

In particular, the professional development needs of experienced teachers are different from those of new teachers. For example, the workshop approach that may be useful for teachers still mastering the classroom craft is not sufficiently relevant or challenging to more experienced teachers. After several years in the classroom, teachers want to explore new areas and take more responsibility for their professional growth. District-wide — or even school-wide — in-service education activities that only elaborate on present practice usually are seen as a waste of time by experienced staff. But few schools or districts explicitly address the professional development needs of their tenured staff. Thus it is not entirely surprising that experienced teachers sometimes feel there is little challenge left for them and 'turn off' from teaching.

A second teacher characteristic, verbal ability, was significantly related to only one outcome measure: total improvement in student performance.[4] However, when student performance was broken down into its cognitive and affective components, the data indicate that teacher verbal ability affects only achievement; it apparently had no significant effect on student affective development.

The most powerful teacher attribute in the Rand analysis was teacher sense of efficacy

— a belief that the teacher can help even the most difficult or unmotivated students.[5] This teacher characteristic showed a strong, positive relationship to all of the project outcome measures. Furthermore, the effects of a sense of efficacy were among the strongest of all the relationships identified in the analysis. Teacher sense of efficacy was positively related to the percentage of project goals achieved, the amount of teacher change, total improved student performance and the continuation of both project methods and materials. Teachers' attitudes about their own professional competence, in short, appear to have major influence on what happens to change agent projects and how effective they are.[6]

An important question for planners is the extent to which a teacher's sense of efficacy can be affected by project design choices, or whether teacher perceptions about their competence is simply a 'given'. The study did not measure this teacher attribute before project activities began, and so cannot report 'before and after' findings. However, the information that was collected furnishes important insights for planners of in-service education. First, teacher sense of efficacy was not significantly related to years of experience or to verbal ability. In other words, a highly verbal, experienced teacher is no more or less likely to feel a sense of efficacy than are other teachers. Second, teachers having a high sense of efficacy tended to be part of projects that placed heavy emphasis on the staff support activities discussed earlier. That is, projects that involved teachers in project decision-making, that provided timely and ongoing assistance in the classroom and that had frequent staff meetings were more likely to have teachers with a high sense of efficacy than were projects with narrowly defined goals, that had little teacher participation or that relied heavily on the use of outside specialists to implement the project.

An obvious question is whether low efficacy and high efficacy teachers were 'selected into' these different project types. Did project directors, based on their assessment of a sense of competence on the part of project teachers, encourage or discourage teacher participation in the project? Or did 'low efficacy' teachers tend to avoid projects in which they would have to play a major role? Though such self-selection undoubtedly occurred to some extent, the fieldwork suggests that project training support activities functioned to enhance teacher efficacy. Staff support activities seemed to promote teacher efficacy in several ways. They provided timely assistance to teachers and a forum in which teachers could talk through project strategies in terms of their own classrooms and thus feel confident in utilizing new ideas. Furthermore, they allowed peer encouragement and development of a sense of ownership in project activities. Staff support activities provided teachers with crucial collegial support in their efforts to change and grow.

Projects that sought staff participation and involvement in project decision-making also conveyed the message to teachers that school administrators viewed them as competent professionals — able to make important decisions about project activities and objectives. A 'Pygmalion effect' of sorts may operate in projects where teachers are given a responsible role. Teachers who are given an opportunity to make decisions about project activities and take responsibility for the substantive direction of their decisions soon acquire such skills.

In summary, the Rand study confirms much of the conventional wisdom concerning the importance of teacher characteristics to the outcome of a planned change effort. But, more importantly, this study also suggests ways in which project design choices and district leadership can influence these important factors.

Implications

The Rand study presents a fundamentally different view of staff development or in-service education from that typically found in the literature or in practice. The study moves away from a traditional view of staff development as a concern about the governance, financing, staffing, delivery and reward structures for 'those workshops' or as a problem of technology transfer. Instead, the Rand study emphasizes learning for professionals as part of ongoing program building in an organizational context. This view of staff development is one of the most important implications of the study.

As part of this view of staff development, the Rand study suggests a number of new assumptions to guide the design and implementation of staff development activities. First, the study suggests that in terms of knowledge about the practice of teaching, teachers often represent the best clinical expertise available. For example, in teaching, as in other clinical settings, the appropriate strategy to resolve problems is unclear. The state of educational research is such that it is difficult to reach consensus concerning the value of almost any set of teaching strategies. For teachers, the learning task is more like problem-solving than like mastering 'proven' procedures. Consequently, outside experts and tightly structured training are relatively less helpful than they are in technology-dominant activities such as industry. The instrumental value of involving classroom teachers in identifying problems and solutions is clearly expressed in the Rand study.

Second, the Rand study describes the process by which an innovation comes to be used in a local setting as adaptive and heuristic. This mode of implementation exemplifies the professional learning process for the projects in the Rand study. In a sense teachers and administrative staff need to 'reinvent the wheel' each time an innovation is brought into the school setting. Reinventing the wheel helps the teachers and administrative staff understand and adjust the innovation to local needs. Learning occurs throughout this adaptation process as staff come to understand their own needs for additional information. Even clarifying the purpose of the innovation is a learning process in itself. Conceptual clarity about project goals in the study evolved as staff learned to understand the implications and nuances of the innovation.

Besides having training that is individualized according to learning rate and learning style, the study found that training and staff support play different roles in this professional learning process. Skill training typically provides the cognitive information and general skills, which then must be adapted within individual classrooms. Outside consultants typically had a difficult time in meeting the learning needs of staff within the training and support staff framework. Whether intentional or not, consultants typically upstaged staff.

A third and related assumption communicated by the Rand study is that professional learning is a long-term, non-linear process. In the study innovation sometimes took one or several years to achieve full implementation. Over this time teachers and administrative staff needed to learn what innovation was needed and what the innovation ought to look like in their particular school setting. They needed to learn what help was needed to implement the innovation as well as the new ideas and skills contained in the skill training. They also needed to learn how to apply these skills or ideas in their classrooms and even how to retain these skills or materials once federal funding had terminated. The continuation of project methods and materials can be seen as a learning problem where the

methods and materials are used under new conditions — the absence of the supporting structure provided by federal funds.

A fourth assumption suggested by this study concerns viewing staff development as part of the program building process in schools. In the Rand study the process of adoption of a specific innovation helped define the program improvement goal for teachers, administrators and project staff. It helped to coalesce the commitment and energies of these groups around the implementation of this innovation and focused the resources and expertise needed to complete the learning process. The three groups — teachers, administrators, project staff — did not necessarily see the goals of the project in congruent terms for several reasons. Moreover, as described above, conceptual clarity evolved as people came to understand the innovation more thoroughly. Consequently, the innovation process helped to focus the energy, commitment, resources and expertise for staff development even though the perception of the project evolved over time and differed, to some extent, by role group. But it was important that professional learning be related to ongoing classroom activities. Staff development activites undertaken in isolation from teachers' day-to-day responsibilities seldom had much impact.[7]

Viewing staff development in the context of program building also helped to shift staff development from a deficit model where teachers are seen as needing in-service because they lack professional skills. In general, the deficit model of staff development is characterized by the view of other educators that teachers need staff development because they lack the necessary skills to teach successfully. This characterization has several elements that need to be understood if the deficit model approach to staff development is to be changed. First, the deficit model is a collective view supported by members of diverse role groups such as principals, school district administrators, university professors, state department of education officials and legislators. This leaves teachers with the belief that everyone is critical of them. Second, these outside groups bring to bear administrative regulations, credential requirements, university degree requirements and state law as a network of reinforcement for their belief: the critical view of other educators is being powerfully communicated to teachers. Third, teachers have typically been excluded from any discussion of their 'deficit' or any discussion about how to carry out its removal. Finally, the deficit model is based on the dogmatic belief of other educators that they know, and can justify, their statements about what constitutes good teaching. Though educational research developed over twenty-five years has not resolved the dilemma of what constitutes good teaching, deficit model outside experts or central office specialists often act as though they know.

A number of features of staff development as part of program building at the school site help to displace the deficit model view of staff development among teachers and administrators. In the Rand study staff development became part of a program improvement process where many role groups needed new skills; teachers were not the only group involved in project skill development activities. Such an approach helped to spread and lessen the psychological risks of change. Teachers also were major decision-makers about the innovative process; outside groups were no longer deciding what teachers ought to know. Moreover, teachers perceived that change was possible on a broader scale because the implementation process itself brought about changes in administrative structures, curriculum and instructional materials strategies as well as in

230

teacher behavior. In fact, integrating teacher improvement with other aspects of school change such as curriculum development and administrative reform increased the effectiveness of the staff development efforts.

In this context the intrinsic motivation associated with teacher professionalism was fostered. This is in sharp contrast to traditional thinking about staff development where the debate seems to focus on which form of extrinsic motivation should be used to get teachers to attend one-shot workshops of other almost ritualistic forms of staff development. In the context of staff development to support the innovation process the Rand study found that the teacher motivation issue was no longer one of persuading teachers to attend staff development meetings to remedy their deficiencies.

A fifth broad assumption suggested by the Rand study concerns the importance of seeing staff development in the context of the school as an organization. Within the most successful projects, the project was not a 'project' at all, but an integral part of an ongoing problem-solving and improvement process within the school. In a sense good staff development never ends; it is a continual characteristic of the school site.

The importance of the organizational context was apparent in all phases of the change process. Projects that sought federal dollars to address an important concern in the entire school were much more successful than were those that were more opportunistic in their search for money. Successful implementation was also dependent upon the organizational climate and the leadership of the school, as well as upon implementation strategies that provided staff with new skills and information but also provided classroom follow-up and other staff support. Extensive teacher participation and a critical mass of school staff needed to bring about change were also necessary ingredients.

Yet it was at the continuation phase of the project where the linkage between staff development activities and the organizational characteristics of the school became most important. In successful projects continuation was a dynamic process that helped maintain changes in teacher practices. Active involvement of both the principal and school district leadership was vital to the maintenance of these changes. Contrary to the common belief that the availability of district funds is the main factor in determining whether successful innovations are retained, the Rand study found that dist ict and school-site organizational factors were more important than were financial factors. From the initiation to the effective institutionalization of an innovation, organizational factors play a vital role. The implementation and especially the long-term effectiveness of in-service efforts are very much influenced by these same organizational 'orces.

In summary, the Rand study suggests that effective staff development activities should incorporate five general assumptions about professional learning:

1 Teachers possess important clinical expertise.
2 Professional learning is an adaptive and heuristic process.
3 Professional learning is a long-term, non-linear process.
4 Professional learning must be tied to school-site program building efforts.
5 Professional learning is critically influenced by organizational factors in the school site and in the district.

These assumptions support a view of staff development emphasizing learning for professionals as part of program building in an organizational context.

The broad view of staff development given by the Rand study has a number of implications for teachers, teacher organizations, school and school district leadership and universities. For teachers, this approach to staff development implies long-term teacher responsibilities, collaborative planning and implementation of significant change in schools. In many ways this is the positive opportunity teachers have asked for for some time. Yet in the past the invitation for teachers to participate in collaborative planning and implementation of significant change has been a mixed message. Teachers were invited to participate without having significant decision-making power and without time being given for them to participate meaningfully. Moreover, school district administrators and colleges often set up a host of bureaucratic regulations that made authentic teacher participation quite difficult. The current financial, legal and political tension within school districts means that the invitation for teacher participation is a complex one. The spring of each school year is better symbolized by dismissal letters and budget cuts than it is by opportunities for new collaborative planning around program improvement.

Teachers will also have to overcome a resulting tendency to feel that they are the victim of external forces. Teachers seem impatient with the long and often arduous process of collaborative planning, learning and adaptation necessary to make innovations successful. Ironically, teachers want to give priority to their role as classroom teachers when the Rand study suggests that their role as collaborative planners has become increasingly important in the context of creating ongoing problem-solving capabilities within schools.

The Rand study also suggests that more experienced teachers may need a different approach to their professional growth than is contained in staff development as part of the implementation of innovations. Some experienced teachers continue to grow personally and professionally, and their contribution as teachers is well respected. In general, however, the Rand study suggests that teachers with many years of experience find it more difficult to bring about change in their own teaching behavior and to maintain the use of new teaching strategies and new teaching materials over time. Lortie also found that many older teachers had shifted a good deal of their energies to family or other outside-school interests, either out of frustration or weariness.[8] A more personal approach to professional growth may be important for more experienced teachers. This approach should emphasize new cognitive frameworks for looking at teaching practice and at their effectiveness as teachers. The apparent mutability of a teacher's sense of efficacy suggested by the Rand study suggests that experienced teachers need not peak out, but can continue to learn and grow.

The Rand study has several implications for the teacher center movement. Our view of staff development emphasizes professional learning as part of program building in an organizational context. Current thinking about teacher centers emphasizes many of the qualities and many of the characteristics of professional learning described above. Yet some of the writing about teacher centers lacks sufficient concern about program building within schools or the organizational context for staff development, which may hinder the ultimate effectiveness of teacher centers as vehicles for staff development. However, teacher centers have very attractive features. The insistence on extensive teacher participation, the call for practical training that is perceived as useful by teachers, and the linkage of teacher behavior and curriculum materials are all strongly supported in the Rand findings.

The Rand research has implications for the roles of principals and school district leadership. The Rand study gives new meaning to the role of instructional leadership for school principals. This instructional role usually connotes activities such as clinical supervision with individual teachers or conducting staff meetings at the school site. The Rand research sets the role of the principal as instructional leader in the context of strengthening the school improvement process through team building and problem-solving in a 'project-like' context. It suggests that principals need to give clear messages that teachers may take responsibility for their own professional growth. The results also emphasize the importance of principals and school district leadership giving special attention to the task of continuation of teacher change and innovation at the school. Administrative involvement for such continuation includes early support for the continuation phase of the innovation cycle, administrative participation during the implementation of the innovation, and attention to the organizational as well as financial consideration for program continuation. Innovation is more a learning process than a systems design problem. Administrators enamored with a systems design or technology transfer notion of change will find little encouragement in the Rand research. On the other hand, the role of administrator was not merely managing the educational enterprise in a static fashion. Successful local projects were part of a dynamic, problem-solving organizational framework headed by a committed administrator.

The Rand research also points to the need for staff development for principals and district administrators. Ironically, these groups have been ignored in federal legislation concerning local educational reform — in part because staff development for administrators would make the federal government appear to be taking too heavy an intervention role in local district affairs. The staff development needs of middle-level managers are usually ignored in most school districts as well. The Rand study suggests that staff development for principals is critical. It is needed to strengthen their ability to carry out the many facets in the innovation process in the context of building an ongoing problem-solving capacity at the school.

Finally, the ineffectiveness of outside consultants in the implementation process raises serious questions about the roles that universities can play in school-based staff development programs. Packaged in-service programs, especially those offered without extensive classroom follow-up and teacher participation, are not likely to be effective according to the Rand research. In turn, however, universities could play several creative roles. First, they could prepare administrators and other school leaders who are able to carry out the innovation process as described in this study. Second, in their pre-service teacher education programs they could prepare teachers to play the secondary role of collaborative planner within a problem-solving dynamic organization. In any role that universities are to take in support of school-based staff development programs it is clear that they need to be part of the ongoing developmental process at the school. This means that they will need to be a part of the collaborative planning and implementation process at the school site. They would need to provide concrete, timely training that is perceived as useful by the teachers and be willing to help in the classroom follow-up process. University faculty would also need to be credible in the school setting and themselves be willing to undergo an adaptation process as they take on these new roles. In short, the Rand study

suggests that universities will have to implement significant change themselves if they are to be effective partners in school district staff development efforts.

NB This article was written over ten years ago. There are now serious teacher shortages in many states. It is still true that a large majority of the teaching force is stable and tenured.

Notes

1 In 1978 Rand completed, under the sponsorship of the United States Office of Education (USOE), a four-year, two-phase study of federally funded programs designed to introduce and spread innovative practices in public schools. This study of federal programs supporting educational change is often referred to as the 'Change Agent Study'. The first phase of the study addressed those factors affecting the initiation and implementation of local 'change-agent' projects. The second phase examined the institutional and project factors that influenced the continuation of innovations after special federal funding terminated. The study collected extensive information from superintendents, district federal program officers, project directors, principals and teachers about the local process of change. In the first phase of the study, 293 local projects were surveyed and fieldwork was conducted in twenty-four schools districts. The second phase of the study involved a survey of 100 projects in twenty states and fieldwork in eighteen school districts. The results of the first phase of the study are summarized in Paul Berman and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV: The Findings in Review* (Santa Monica, CA.: Rand Corporation [R-1589/4-HEW], April 1975). The findings of the second phase are reported in Paul Berman and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VII: Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation* (Santa Monica, CA.: Rand Corporation [R-1589/7-HEW], April 1977). See also *Making Change Happen?*, a series of articles on the Phase I study in *Teachers College Record*, 7 (3) (February 1976).

2 These five dependent measures as discussed here (percentage of project goals achieved, total teacher change, total student performance gain, continuation of teacher methods, continuation of project materials) were continuous variables derived from the teacher questionnaire. Berman and McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV*, Ch. 4 describe these measures and their validity in detail.

3 The enthusiasm of principals is also an important element in introducing project methods to additional school sites. A superintendent commented, 'This project has really been sustained through the direction and enthusiasm of principals. They were tremendously enthused, at first particularly, and so the project spread to other schools.'

4 Teachers' verbal ability was measured by a self-administered Quick Word Test consisting of a fifty-question, multiple-choice, vocabulary-type test. The test, developed by Edgar F. Borgatta and Raymond Corsini (*Quick Word Test* [New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, nd]) as a measure of verbal abilities, has high reliability and is correlated highly with more complex measures of intelligence. See Berman and McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VII, op. cit.*, p. 137.

5 The measure of teachers' sense of efficacy was based on two questions. One asked whether the teacher felt that 'when it comes down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment.' The other asked whether the teacher thought that 'if I really try hard, I can get through to even the most

234

difficult or unmotivated students.' Responses to these two questions were combined into a single measure of efficacy: the extent to which the teacher believed he or she had the capacity to affect student performance (Berman and McLaughlin, *ibid.*).

6 A Rand study of the School Preferred Reading program in Los Angeles drew heavily on the instrumentation and design of the Change Agent study and reached similar conclusions. Specifically, it concluded that 'the more efficacious the teachers felt, the more their students advanced in reading achievement.' See David Armor *et al.*, *Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools* (Santa Monica, CA.: Rand Corporation [R-2007-LAUSD], August 1976). This study used, as the dependent variable, the change in individual students' scores on a standardized reading test.

7 See especially Appendix A in Peter W. Greenwood, Dale Mann, and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: The Process of Change* (Santa Monica, CA.: Rand Corporation [R-1589/3-HEW], April 1975.

8 Dan Lortie, *School Teacher* (Chicago, IL.: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

Chapter 12

Schools for the Twenty-first Century: The Conditions for Invention

Phillip C. Schlechty

It is becoming clear that the fate of the education reform movement in America depends upon the willingness of public school educators to understand and embrace the proposition that nothing short of fundamental restructuring of schools will suffice if the continuing vitality of public education is to be assured. Repair of existing structures is not enough. This is the message underlying what is coming to be called the 'second wave of school reform', and it is a message with which I am comfortable.

The Carnegie Task Force report contains some of the strongest rhetoric regarding the need for fundamental restructuring, but this task force is not alone in the view that restructuring is essential. Writers like Boyer, Goodlad and Sizer have arrived at similar conclusions, and other commissions have made recommendations quite similar to those of the Carnegie Task Force. For example, the Holmes Group report on needed reform in teacher education implicitly assumes a fundamental restructuring of schools, as do various segments of the National Governors' Association Task Force report.

Just as I am comfortable with the general notion that nothing short of fundamental restructuring of schools will suffice, I am also in general agreement with the proposition that the appropriate target for the second wave of school reform is what goes on inside the schoolhouse and the classroom. Lengthening the school day is not likely to have desired effects if what goes on during the school day is not changed. More is not necessarily better.

I am, however, more than a bit concerned with the fact that most proponents of restructuring schools overlook — or look past — the roles of district-level personnel and the functions of district-level variables in shaping the conditions under which reform in the schoolhouse and the classroom can and will occur. Principals cannot share authority that is not theirs to share any more than teachers can carry out functions the union contract precludes them from carying out. So long as board policy and the procedures by which principals are evaluated tolerate, if they do not encourage, principals behaving in authoritarian ways, then teacher empowerment is totally dependent on the personal orientations and needs of each building principal in a school district. These, and related matters, have had little attention in the present discussion on school reform.

The purpose in this chapter is to call attention to the real and potential linkage

236

between district-level concerns and efforts to restructure schools at the level of the schoolhouse and the classroom. The reader who is seeking a detailed description of a preferred form of building-level school organization will be disappointed. We know far too little to prescribe precisely how individual schools should be organized, how new technology should be used, or even how the school day should be spent. These are matters that need to be addressed, but those who should address them are teachers and building administrators. The critical question is: how can district-level leaders assure that these issues will be addressed in each school building, and how they can assure that the manner in which these issues are addressed will result in schools that produce 'better performance by students and more sensible conditions of work for teachers' (Sizer, 1986, p. 38). This chapter is intended to contribute to the discussion of this important topic.

Vision at the Top

If educators learn nothing else from the recent literature on America's best-run businesses, they should learn the importance of strong and visionary leadership at the very top of the organization. Principals are at the top of the schools they lead, but they are not at the top of the school system of which they are a part (except in very small school districts).

Without strong and visionary leadership, businesses have a difficult time maintaining direction, and so do school districts. Furthermore, even failing businesses, especially failing large businesses, so have some pockets of excellence (educators would call these 'outlier' schools) that seem to produce quality while the overall business is deteriorating. Thus the conditions of business are not dissimilar from the conditions of education, where failing school systems have some successful schools. Unfortunately, the significance of district-level leadership to the continuing health of the reform movement in education has all but escaped the attention of reformers and those who write commission reports.

Few who are presenting analyses and prescriptions for school reform have given careful attention to the fact that in almost all instances the primary vehicle through which state policy is made operational in local school buildings and classrooms is local boards of education and the offices of superintendent. There is, for example, a growing concern among local superintendents and members of boards of education that the reform movement has eroded the tradition of local control. There are various ways in which local boards of education and superintendents can react to this perceived threat, not the least of which is to sabotage with paper compliance. Indeed, in my work as a consultant, I have heard two reform-minded governors say specifically that one of the greatest problems that they have experienced is that they have vastly underestimated the capacity of local administrators and local boards of education to engage in ritual compliance and explicit sabotage.

It is difficult to describe how district-level attributes shape the response to reform efforts, but it is obvious that such shaping does occur. If the second wave of school reform is to be anything more than a manifestation of the charismatic leadership of a powerful building principal or the result of the peculiar combination of sophisticated and rebellious teachers located in a school building, it will be necessary for the relationships among boards of education, school superintendents and other parts of the school system to undergo at

least as fundamental a restructuring and reorientation as is now called for in the more radical proposals for the restructuring of building-level units.

More importantly, what seems to be missing in much of the present literature on reform is recognition that without visionary and enabling leadership at the school district level, the dual values of equity and excellence are not likely to be pursued. More specifically, if one assumes that the critical determinants of excellence in schools are the personal characteristics of principals and teachers and if one assumes that once outstanding persons have been recruited all that is needed is to grant them decision-making autonomy, the pursuit of excellence in schools will be spotty indeed.

No doubt great principals and great teachers can produce excellence, even when others cannot. The literature on effective schools had its genesis in the identification of such heroic principals and faculties. Unfortunately — and here I parallel the arguments of Sykes (Chapter 6, this volume) — heroism is not in unlimited supply. If we depend upon heroic performance for excellence, we will perhaps get excellence for those few students who are lucky enough to go to those schools that by chance recruited the right people at the right time. Thus the value of equity will be missed.

The idea that the most expedient way to school reform is by getting supermen and superwomen and freeing them from the shackles of mindless bureaucracies has considerable ideological appeal. Autonomy, naively conceived, can, however, become anarchy. Though anarchy may produce excellence for the few, it will produce mediocrity and worse for the many. One of the arguments for bureaucratization (i.e., standardization, centralization of authority, job specialization, etc.) is that while it suppresses excellence, it does raise the standard by which mediocre is measured.

Neither the first wave nor the second wave of school reform is likely to produce the results hoped for and anticipated until and unless we come to understand that the task of wedding strategy, structures and systems (the hard Ss) with staff, style, skill and superordinate goals (the soft Ss) cannot be carried out either at the building level or at the state level. This task must be carried out by boards of education and the administrative staffs that they employ. Whether or not the schools of the future will be intentionally invented (or simply happen) depends in large measure upon whether these district-level structures can be reformed and reconceptualized in ways that make it possible to provide direction and leadership to the difficult task of reinventing public education in America. The first step in such a reconceptualization is to think through the assumptions we hold about schools and school reform. Furthermore, we must consider the images we have of teachers, students and schools and how these images shape thinking about how school districts can and should be led.

A Preliminary View

The following discussion is based on two assumptions:

1 The continuing vitality of public education in America depends, in large measure, upon the willingness of educators fundamentally to redesign and restructure schools, especially with regard to the way decisions are made, the

way results are viewed and pursued and the way schools are organized and managed.

2 Whatever form this restructuring takes, it will require a fundamental shifting of power arrangements within school buildings and among the various constituencies that provide the context within which building-level faculties function. More specifically, if public education is to survive as a vital force, the claims of teachers for increased decision-making authority and the recommendations of educational reformers and theorists for greater autonomy at the building level must be respected.

Two Approaches to School System Management

There are basically two ways that schools can be managed: the first is management by programs; the second is management by results. Management by programs is consistent with bureaucratic orientations. In bureaucratic management the critical question is, 'Do those who are assigned to do specific tasks do what they are supposed to do when they are supposed to do it?' Management by results shifts the focus to outcomes. Instead of asking the question, 'Do those who are assigned the task do things right?', the question becomes, 'Do those who are assigned the objective, goal and outcome do the right thing?'

Doing things right focuses attention on routinization, standardization and tight supervision. It encourages conservatism and discourages inventiveness. An emphasis on results and doing the right things encourages, indeed requires, independent decision-making and autonomy, while it increases accountability and requires detailed attention to the assessment of performance. If schools are to become the adaptive organizations that they must become to respond to the rapidly changing needs of a post-industrial society, it is essential that they become more inventive. To become inventive, the tendency of schools toward bureaucratic solutions must be offset. Whether or not these tendencies can be offset depends in large measure on the willingness of teachers and administrators to abandon traditional ways of thinking about schooling and schooling processes. Among other things the men and women who were attracted to and/or learned their trade at a time when the ability to control schools and to control students through the management of programs and classrooms must now learn to direct schools and direct students through conscious and disciplined acts of leadership. As Drucker (1973, p. 30) writes, they 'will have to learn to lead rather than manage, direct rather than control.'

The Importance of People

Teachers and administrators are drawn from that class of persons that Kelley (1982) refers to as gold-collar workers. Unlike the blue-collar worker who works for a living and the white-collar workers who lives to work, the gold-collar worker expects work and life to be integrated. The gold-collar worker is not simply interested in a standard of living; the gold-collar worker is interested in style of life. Among the most important of these life-

style values are opportunities for personal growth and development, job variety and opportunities to engage in creative and meaningful interactions with other adults.

Given present demographic trends and economic developments, it appears likely that the number of jobs being created which will appeal to the values of the gold-collar worker is likely to be well in excess of the number of gold-collar workers available to fill those jobs, especially by the 1990s. Given that public education is a public sector job, it is unlikely that public education can ever directly compete with the private sector in terms of absolute salary and absolute standard of living. Thus, if public education does not compete with the private sector on the life-style dimension, it is doubtful that schools will be able to attract enough talented people to maintain the quality of schools, let alone increase that quality. One of the keys to the quality of life in the workplace is the ability to feel that one is in control of one's own destiny and that one is making a special contribution — in a word 'empowerment'.

One of the unfortunate consequences of the early debate regarding empowering teachers is the assumption that the phrase means taking power away from principals and other administrators. This is nonsense. Leaders who lead leaders are inherently more powerful and necessarily will be more capable than are managers who control the powerless and disenfranchised. Leadership generates power by transforming the environment and those who are led. Weak organizations provide little decision-making authority, even for the top leaders. Strong organizations increase the potential autonomy of all who are associated with them.

The ability of education to attract, retain, develop and motivate high performing teachers and administrators will be seriously compromised (even more so than it is now) if the status, authority, honor, recognition and responsibility of the position of teacher and principal are not greatly enhanced.

The Professionalization of Teaching

Medicine and law stand as the archetypes of professions. When one speaks of teaching as a profession, there is a tendency to compare the conditions of teaching to the conditions of medical and legal practice. Such comparisons usually lead to the conclusion that teaching is a semi-profession and sometimes to the conclusion that teaching can never be a profession since many of the conditions that make medicine a profession (e.g., free choice in the client/practitioner relationship) do not exist in education.

As one who has made considerable use of medical analogies to help gain insight into the schooling enterprise, I am aware that many educators resist and resent the use of such analogies, precisely because they know that the conditions under which teaching is practised and the conditions under which law and medicine are practised are different in fundamental ways. In spite of this resistance, much of the momentum behind some of the more recent reform efforts (e.g., national board certification) gains its inspiration from fields like medicine and law. Furthermore, some of the recommendations regarding how schools might be organized (e.g., the Carnegie Commission's suggestions regarding schools managed by lead teachers, operating with teams of colleagues) are clearly inspired by insights drawn from an analysis of managerial systems that typify many hospitals.

240

In advocating the professionalization of teaching, I have frequently used medical analogies to make my point. For example, I have argued that teacher education could be much improved if we were more attentive to the characteristic patterns by which physicians are prepared. I have argued for a distinction between certification and licensure and for disciplining teaching and administrative practice with research. I have not changed my position on any of these matters, and I continue to find medical analogies useful. However, I have become convinced that the image of schools as hospitals and the image of teachers as professionals in an occupation structured like medicine and law have taken the thinking of educational reformers about as far as they can.

It is time to generate a new image, a new vision — one that is more consistent with the realities of school life, but at the same time bestows the honor and status on teachers that is needed if schools are to survive. It is essential that this new image have intuitive appeal to those who are making the greatest demands on public schools and who are also the potential source for the greatest support for public school reform (i.e., those business leaders who are being called on to reinvent America's corporate structures, who themselves manage professional knowledge workers, and who themselves assure productivity through people). Finally, it is critical that the new image of schools be such that it conceptually provides a legitimate place for the influence of boards of education (who are not themselves professionals) and a place for the central office apparatus which generally shapes the context in which local school reform will occur.

A Place to Begin

In seeking a place to begin to build a new image of schools, I am persuaded by two facts: (1) whatever else schools are, they are places where adults endeavor to get the young to engage in purposeful activity, i.e., to do work; and (2) the kind of work that the schools try to get children to do is strikingly similar to the kind of work that they will be called upon to do later in life, for the jobs they will take will require considerable facility in working with knowledge and knowledge-related products. In sum, schools are knowledge-work organizations.

So far as I can determine, Peter Drucker coined the term 'knowledge worker'. Drucker was concerned that the nature of the American economy was (is) shifting. In the early to mid-twentieth century the primary task of management was (or so it seemed) to control, regularize and standardize production processes, most of which called on persons to put to work manual skill or muscle. Scientific management, time and motion studies, attention to financial controls, performance inspection and tight supervision (e.g., the axiom that span of control for any manager should be between five and eight persons) were all a part of this management thinking. Unfortunately, what industrial engineers, industrial psychologists and industrial sociologists came to know, or think they knew, regarding management procedures had more to do with controlling the activity of unskilled or semi-skilled workers who were working on a relatively clearly defined product or using relatively clearly defined processes.

What was happening, however, was that American business was shifting from an industrial based to an information-based economy. What was called for was a type of

management that could manage in turbulent times, for technological advances were proceeding at a more rapid rate than current theories and conventional strategies could embrace. What was called for was a manager who could manage people who perhaps knew more about their jobs than the leader (manager) knew.

In brief, Drucker (1973) suggested that managers must confront the problem of managing people who work primarily with concepts, ideas and theories rather than with tools, equipment or brawn. Furthermore, these managers must be concerned with products yet unknown, produced by processes yet to be created. Drucker summarized as follows:

1 'Management will, therefore, have to run at one and the same time an existing managerial organization and a new innovative organization' (p. 31).
2 Management 'will have to learn to lead rather than manage and direct rather than control' (p. 30).
3 'Knowledge work cannot be productive unless the knowledge worker finds out who he is himself, what kind of work he is fitted for, and how he works best' (p. 33).
4 'There can be no divorce of planning from doing knowledge work. On the contrary, the knowledge worker must be able to plan himself' (p. 33).
5 It is not possible to 'objectively determine one best way for any kind of work to be done. There may be one best way, but it is heavily conditioned by the individual and not entirely determined by the physical or even by the mental characteristics of the job. It is temperamental as well' (p. 33).
6 'Making knowledge work productive will bring about changes in job structure, careers, and organizations as drastic as those which resulted in the factory from the application of scientific management to manual work' (p. 33).

Students as Knowledge Workers

Children come to school with knowledge, and while they are in school, it is assumed that they will gain more knowledge. How do they gain knowledge? By working on knowledge and knowedge-related products. Whether the reader is a behaviorist or a Gestalt psychologist, he or she will surely agree that learning is an active process. Furthermore, schools are designed to make learning happen on purpose rather than by random chance. Indeed, if schools cannot produce learning that would not occur without them, then why have them (except, of course, as a custodial service for working parents). Thus schools are places where children are induced to engage in purposeful activity (a dictionary definition of 'work' is 'purposeful activity') which in turn is expected to result in (or produce) learning (i.e., to gain knowledge and skill). In other words, schools are places where children are expected to work on, with and for knowledge. Both logic and common sense suggest that schools are knowledge-work organizations, and children are knowledge workers.

The idea of the student as worker is not novel. Educational researchers (e.g., Bossert, Doyle) have frequently made use of the image of students as workers in conceptualizing

their own research tasks and analysis. Furthermore, those who fear that the conception of student as worker is inherently anti-intellectual should consider the work of Theodore Sizer. One of the chief criticisms of Sizer's recommendations for school reform is that his image of the desirable high school too closely parallels the image of the élite New England academy. Yet Sizer is comfortable with recommending that students should be viewed as workers.

Unfortunately, and in spite of the work language surrounding school (who has not heard of home work, class work, busy work, seat work?), there remains a residue of anti-intellectualism in the American education establishment. Part of the resistance to the idea of students as workers must surely lie in the assumption that doing things with ideas, symbols and concepts is inherently purposeless or certainly non-productive. If this were not the case, few could argue with the simple proposition that students are, indeed, knowledge workers.

The Teacher as Executive

Conceptualizing the student as worker has important consequences for the way schools are viewed and the way the problems that schools must confront are framed. First, it brings the student clearly inside the school as an active and responsible member of the organization as opposed to passive 'raw material' that teachers are supposed to work on and shape into an acceptable product. Second, it shifts attention away from selecting, sorting and grading and focuses attention on motivating, instructing and leading. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it requires the teacher to shift from the role of information processor and inspector to the role of manager and leader.

The parallels between the role of the teacher as manager/leader (i.e., as executive) and the role of executives in the business sector have not completely escaped the attention of educators. Indeed, David Berliner (1983) has done a considerable amount of work in developing this concept. To date, however, the conception of the teacher as executive has not enjoyed a prominent place in the thinking of reformers. The cause of fundamental reform in schools could be much advanced if the image of the teacher as executive had a more prominent place in shaping the thinking of boards of education and top line school administrators.

First, the conception of the role of teacher as executive enhances the role of teachers and implicitly argues that teachers, like other executives, must have considerable decision-making autonomy if they are to be effective. Second, the image of the teacher as an executive recognizes that teacher productivity is achieved through other people. Thus arguments about the evaluation of teachers shift from inspecting products to the evaluation of results. Similarly, the image requires both teachers and administrators to understand that there is no one best way to teach, just as there is no one best way to lead. The context, the nature of the task and the intellectual and emotional m[illegible]urity of the workforce all must be taken into account in making executive decisions regarding how to lead, just as these things must be taken into account in making decisions regarding how to teach.

Finally, conceiving teachers as executives, rather than as members of a free-standing

profession like medicine, acknowledges and legitimizes the 'corporate nature' of public education. For example, like corporations (at least like successful corporations), schools must be attentive to the conditions of the market. Teachers and school administrators must help shape school goals, but in the end schools will survive only if they effectively pursue goals (i.e., produce results) that are valued by the communities which support them. Though some find it ideologically repugnant to acknowledge that it is so, the fact remains that schools are not established solely to meet the needs of students. Schools are established to meet societal needs as well. As Durkheim (1956, p. 123) has put the matter, 'education, far from having as its unique or principal object the individual and his interests, as above all the means by which society perpetually recreates the conditions of its very existence.'

Executives know that they must satisfy the needs of the workforce if they are to produce products that will satisfy customers. The executive, like the teacher, must constantly be negotiating the goals, aspirations, needs and talents of those who work for them and the goals of the organizations of which they are a part. I seriously doubt that many children can be motivated to learn to read on the basis that if they fail to learn to read, American business will be unable to compete. On the other hand, failure to take into account the needs of our economy for an intelligent and highly motivated workforce is a failure that cannot be endured. Furthermore, it must be understood that in the broadest sense almost all school work is, or should be thought of as, vocational education, since most of the vocations that children of the twenty-first century will enter will require them to do knowledge work.

The Principal as Leader of Instructors

As executives, teachers are, or should be, the primary instructional leaders in the school. Does this mean that the role of the principal should be abandoned? I think not, but it does mean that the role of the principal should be fundamentally reconceptualized. Rather than being required to manage and control, the principal will need to learn to lead. More than that, the principal will need to learn to lead persons who are themselves conceived to be leaders and to develop leadership among those he or she leads. Leadership development is the primary task of a leader of leaders (see, for example, Grove, 1983).

As indicated earlier, empowering teachers does not disenfranchise principals; rather, it empowers principals. For example, as a leader of leaders, the principal is less concerned with whether a teacher implements the principal's decision in the 'right way' than with whether the teacher makes the right decision and then implements it. This suggests, of course, that the principal must understand that 'the right decision' is not always the decision that he/she would have made, but it is the decision that produces the results that both the teacher and the principal agree should be produced.

The Superintendent as Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

The emerging literature on effective corporations gives considerable attention to the role of the chief executive officer in shaping the values of the organization, articulating those

244

values and inspiring and supporting others to pursue those values. However, the literature on effective schools, indeed most of the literature on school reform, is largely silent regarding the role of the superintendent.

Since we are largely ignorant regarding the specifics of the superintendency and the dynamics of effective school systems, we can only assume that the characteristics of effective superintendents and effective school systems are not too dissimilar from the characteristics of effective leaders in knowledge-work organizations generally.

If this assumption is granted, a cursory glance at how typical school systems are organized and a cursory view of the roles of school superintendents make one wonder whether we can possibly have any effective school systems at all. First, effective CEOs seem to be persons of vision and passion. They are constantly pushing for innovation and change and are persistent in identifying and announcing problems and inspiring others to invent solutions to them. One could characterize effective organizations as places where trouble-making is centralized and problem-solving is decentralized.

The idea of the superintendent as a problem-identifier and trouble-maker is anathema to most school systems. Superintendents are expected to be problem-solvers, not trouble-makers. For example, a superintendent who announces that 'we have a dropout problem' is as likely to be fired for not having solved the problem as he is to be applauded for trying to get others to solve it for him. Indeed, many superintendents spend much of their time convincing board members and the press that 'we're no worse than anyone else' rather than setting in motion programs and activities that will assure that 'we're better than everyone else.' As I have indicated elsewhere (Schlechty, 1985), the structure of school finance and the lack of long-term developmental funds makes it difficult, if not impossible, for superintendents to engage in long-term, visionary thinking about school improvement.

Put directly, the knowledge-work conception of schools requires that the superintendent be a strong and forceful leader, an educator of the community about education and its problems, and an inspirer of decisions rather than a decision-maker. More than that, the knowledge-work conception of schools requires that the office of the superintendent be viewed as the moral and ethical center of the organization. For this to happen, it is essential that the superintendency be reconceptualized. It will require a relationship between superintendents and boards of education which is more like the relationship between CEOs and boards of directors than is now the case. It will also require considerably more fiscal autonomy than typical patterns of state and federal categorical funding now permit. If teachers are to be empowered, principals must be empowered, and if principals are to be empowered, superintendents must be empowered as well.

One of the most critical problems to be addressed over the next decade is the problem of reforming the superintendency so that the occupants of this office can provide the vital leadership that a sustained school improvement effort will require. A second critical problem is identifying, developing and motivating men and women of stature and vision to lead school systems into the twenty-first century. If we want to invent schools where ordinary people can give extraordinary performances, then we must have extraordinary men and women to lead them.

Developing a Clear Image*

For school reform to be anything more than the result of idiosyncratic responses to national reports by individual principals and faculties, it is essential that superintendents and boards of education see themselves, and be seen by others, as clear leaders in the effort to improve schools. The first act in asserting leadership could be to develop clear answers to the following questions:

1. How do we view students; what is their role in the education enterprise?
2. Given this view of students, how do we view teachers, principals and other employees of the school system?
3. Given this view of teachers, students and schools, what kinds of management systems are appropriate to assure that this view or image will be consistently reinforced throughout the school district?

I have already suggested the image of teachers, students and schools that I believe should guide our thinking about school reform, but I would be remiss if I did not mention at least two other possibilities. The first is the student as a product of the school system; the second is the student as a client or customer.

The idea of the student as a product has the advantage of being commonplace in our present thinking. It is perfectly consistent with the idea of the school as a factory, the teacher as a member of a relatively unskilled workforce and the principal as a shop foreman. Tight supervision, carefully prescribed curricula (teacher-proof materials) and rigorous testing and inspection flow naturally from such a view.

Viewing students as products removes students from the accountability structure of the system (products are passive; they are worked on, not with; they are shaped, not led). Viewing students as products also suggests working conditions for teachers which are unlikely to be attractive to gold-collar workers and suggests a form of management that is not likely to inspire principals who see their major task as 'getting others to lead'.

Viewing students as clients or customers does offset some of the more bleak qualities suggested by the image of the student as a product. Furthermore, viewing students as clients does enhance the status of teachers; at least it has the potential of doing so. Specifically, if students are clients to be served or customers to be serviced, it becomes possible to view teachers as 'professionals'. Unfortunately, the customer or client image only partially addresses the issue of professionalism, unless one embraces some of the more or less radical forms of 'student choice' with regard to schools attended, teachers assigned and so on. More importantly, however, the client view totally overlooks the fact that education has a cultural and social base as well as a psychological base. Schools are established to serve the ends of society as well as the ends of children and their parents. Schools provide not only what is wanted, but also what sophisticated adults believe is needed. One of the functions of education is socialization, and socialization is inherently non-voluntary.

Obviously, I have overlooked many positive attributes that could be assigned to the image of students as products or students as clients, and I have not gone far in describing

*Some of the ideas and materials presented here appear in an earlier version (see Schlechty, 1985).

248

the management implications of each of these images. The reason is that I have chosen my image, and the space left to me seems more wisely used in providing a detailed description of the implications of the image than in building up and tearing down straw men.

The image suggested (of students as products or clients) has considerable appeal. Indeed, many of the decisions policy-makers take are implicitly based on assumptions that derive from such views. For example, many current systems for evaluating teachers which are 'based on the research on teaching' are strikingly similar to evaluation systems used in factories where 'scientific management' relies heavily on the time and motion studies of industrial engineers for guidance and direction. What is critical is that those who run schools and those who work in them must fully understand the images that shape their thinking and appreciate the consequences of embracing one image or the other. No choice is more important than the choice of the way the school leaders view the position of the student in the system of things, for that choice, more than any other, will determine the direction school reform will take in a given school district.

Implications of the Knowledge-Work Metaphor for District Local Leadership

Having suggested the knowledge-work metaphor to numerous audiences, I am aware that some readers will find the ideas presented here disquieting. For example, I have suggested that the fundamental purpose of school is to get children to do school work. Such a suggestion will immediately conjure up the image of the autocratic teacher putting powerless students through numerous rote drills, filling out workbooks, memorizing lists and other banal forms of activity. It is true that school work can be busy work. It is also true that school work can be non-productive work. It is equally true, however, that schools cannot systematically produce learning if children cannot be brought to do school work. The first and most necessary condition of effective schools resides in their capacity to get children to do school work. Perhaps a distinction between purpose and goals will clarify this point.

Purpose and Goals

Purpose refers to the functions that must be fulfilled on a daily basis to achieve goals; goals indicate the intended results of acting with a clear purpose in view. For example, the purpose of every business is to get and keep customers. The goals of businesses vary but usually include making a profit, producing products that customers will buy and providing employees with working conditions that create commitment and inspire high quality performance. *Purpose suggests what must be done today; goals indicate the intended consequences of what is done.* More than that, goals indicate how purpose should be pursued. Without clear goals, the pursuit of any purpose is likely to be meaningless. Conversely, without a clear understanding of purpose, goals are not likely to be achieved.

The purpose of schools is to induce students to do those forms of school work that teachers and administrators assume will result in (produce) the students' acquiring the

knowledge and skills that the goals of the school and the school system suggest should be acquired. The nature and form that school work takes will depend upon the goals that the community assigns to the schools. Furthermore, the way school work is designed, the ways schools motivate students to do school tasks, and the quality of the instruction the students are given regarding the content of the tasks that they are assigned are primary determinants of the success the students have in doing school work. Effective schools not only assure that students do things right, but they also assure that students are called on to do the right things. Thus schools are not simply organizations designed to manage students; they are organizations which are called upon to lead students as well. As Bennis and Nanus (1985) observe, 'Managers do things right. Leaders do the right thing.'

On Doing the Right Things

Embracing the notion that the student is a knowledge worker, and thus an active and accountable participant in the life of the school, does not shift the responsibility of student productivity from school officials to the students or to the students' parents. Indeed, the reverse is the case, for inherent in the knowledge metaphor is the idea that in the long run the quality of a leader's performance can be no higher than the quality of the performance of those who are led. The productivity of the leader can be no higher than the productivity of the subordinate, and the success of the executive in the long run is to be judged by the success of those over whom the executive exercises authority. It is apparent that getting students to 'do things right' is important, but deciding 'what is the right thing to get them to do' is equally important. Indeed, a school district could be very efficient (i.e., getting students to do things right at the lowest possible cost) and at the same time be very ineffective (i.e., fail to produce results that are valued by the constituencies whose support must be maintained if the school system is to survive). Once the knowledge worker image is embraced, board members and superintendents must be especially attentive to assuring that the systems they lead are doing the right things. In seeking guidance in this regard, there are three key questions that system-level policy-makers must constantly ask:

1. What is our school system about (i.e., what are its binding goals and commitments)?
2. If we continue to do what we are now doing, what will our school system be about in five to ten years?
3. What should our school system be about?

Answers to these questions are not easy to come by, but they are impossible to come by unless one is attuned to the notion of measurable results. For example, if one wanted to know what a school system is about, a way to begin to answer this question would be to examine the school system's budget. When additional resources become available, where are the funds allocated? (It is likely that boards of education that evenly distribute budget cuts or budget increases across all programs and projects often do so because they do not know, cannot agree or will not acknowledge what their school system is about.) Another way to determine what a school system is about is to measure the way time is allocated. To whom do principals most frequently talk, and what do they talk about? What groups,

218

constituencies and items command the superintendent's attention? To what subjects or activities do teachers give their time in classrooms, in faculty meetings and in the lounge? What items dominate the attention of the school board? The way money is allocated and the way time is allocated are both results which are measurable. Furthermore, these results give a clear indication of the operational goals and priorities of the system. Thus, one could, through a process of induction, gain a relatively clear image of what the goals and priorities of a school system are by examining how resources (money, time, personnel, etc.) are allocated.

It can be argued that such results are far removed from the results of the school (i.e., student achievement). Perhaps, but one of the most effective ways of increasing student achievement is to induce students to concentrate energy and attention on worthwhile school work. Similarly, it would make sense that the principal who is effective at leading instructors would spend more time in instructional activity than the principal who is not so effective. This is common sense, but, unfortunately, common sense is not common knowledge or common practice.

To gain a sense of what a school system might be about if the system continues to function over the next five to ten years as it is now functioning, one needs to look at trends. For example, one could look at budgets over the past five to ten years to determine changes which have occurred. Data could be collected to determine whether teachers were spending more or less time on any given activity than they did in the past. Such an analysis could go far to help policy-makers determine where they are and where they are likely to be headed. But there is more here that is even more critical. To give meaning to the measure of present results, policy-makers must have a clear image of where they want to go as well as a detailed knowledge of where they are and where they seem to be going.

Perhaps the most useful element of the effective schools and effective teaching literature is that it provides a focus for serious discussions among policy-makers regarding where they want the systems they manage to go. For example, the literature indicates that teachers and schools which spend more time on academic tasks increase the amount of academic learning that occurs. The easy logic would be to suggest that what must be done, therefore, is to lengthen the school day or lengthen the school year. Perhaps this is so, but there are other alternatives. For example, one could imagine a scenario where the academic learning time could be increased by developing policies intended to reduce the number of interruptions in schools and classrooms. Other alternatives might include making the decision that academic programs would take precedence and priority over all other programs in the school system and that when choice points occur (e.g., attending a history class or football practice during the last period of the day), the academic program is given precedence.

These options are suggested as points of illustration rather than as points of advocacy. They illustrate that careful consideration of what school is about and what the priorities should be is a paramount responsibility to top-level decision-makers in every school system. Admittedly, articulating a clear goal is almost certain to generate value clashes and disagreement. Many school boards carefully attempt to avoid such open values clashes (Vidich and Bensman, 1957). It takes considerable courage for superintendents to foster such potentially tension-producing discussions. However, unless school boards and superintendents are willing to take such risks, there is little likelihood that the school

reform movement will have any systematic effects. What effects the movement has will be left up to chance encounters by dynamic principals or virtuous preformances by rebellious faculties. If the literature on effective schools and on America's best-run businesses verifies anything, it verifies most clearly the old adage that 'people who know where they're going are more likely to get there.'

Management by Results

One of the happy outcomes of the effective schools literature is that the findings seem to coincide with what management theorists like Drucker (1973) suggest to be the case in other organizations. Simply put, organizations which use measurable output as a means of directing individual and collective action are more effective than are organizations which use other criteria for direction (e.g., the whims of administrators or the personal preferences of employees). One of the unhappy outcomes of the effective schools literature may be to encourage education policy-makers to confuse results which are easily measurable (e.g., standardized test scores) with measurable results. At the risk of seeming pedantic, I would suggest that if there is a single most important lesson that educators could learn from the studies of America's best-run businesses (e.g., Peters and Waterman, 1982; Grove, 1983), it is that there is a difference between management results and the results of management. Furthermore, the results by which managers should manage are management results rather than the results of management.

Management results refer to events over which the manager (in this category I include teachers as well as principals) has some direct control and the possibilities of direct influence. For example, the effective teaching literature indicates that teachers have considerable control over how time is used in their classrooms and that teachers vary considerably in the way they allocate and manage time. The allocation of time is a management result, and as such, it is a result for which the teacher as executive can reasonably be held accountable. Similarly, the effective schools literature indicates that principals vary considerably in the extent to which they are visible in the school, the extent to which they visit classrooms, and the frequency with which they hold job-oriented conversations with teachers. Increasing or decreasing the frequency of such occurrences is a matter which is generally under the control of principals. It is a management result and a result for which a principal can justifiably be held accountable.

The effective teaching and effective schools literature also suggests that when principals and teachers produce management results like those indicated above, the results are likely to be improved test scores. However, neither teachers nor principals have direct control over test scores, and one of the first axioms of sound management theory is that persons should not be held accountable for events over which they exercise little or no control.

The key, of course, is that school boards and top leaders must have a clear notion of what they expect students, teachers, principals and others to do; they must communicate these expectations clearly, check to see if those things are being done, provide corrective action and support where they are not being done, and then assess whether the doing of these things produces the end results that are intended.

2511

It is critical, however, that policy-makers not confuse results with the way results are achieved. Process should not be confused with product. For example, one principal might assure effective leadership by conducting in-service workshops for faculty which focus on adult leadership and then delegate leadership responsibilities to faculty members. Another principal might have an uncanny knack for identifying and recruiting personnel who have the requisite leadership skills. In both instances the management results could be essentially the same (i.e., the presence of strong and effective instructional leadership). The management result is what is important, and these results can be measured. Designing schools for the future should not be viewed as a quest for a cookbook or recipe. Research and prescriptions can provide preliminary statements of some measurable management results which seem to be associated with student achievement on some very narrow measures. It is up to policy-makers to determine what other results they wish to pursue.

Once such decisions have been made, it should be possible for researchers to provide assistance and guidance in determining what types of management results are most likely to produce the end results (i.e., the results of management) that policy-makers desire. For example, it may be that a very different approach to teaching is required to increase student problem-solving skills than is required to help students master the basic skills needed to decode the printed word (just as managing unskilled workers requires different leadership styles than does the management of skilled workers). This is not to suggest an either/or situation but rather that those who decide what management results they wish to pursue and those who have the power to enforce these decisions are the only persons who can and should be held responsible for the results of management. Boldly stated, it is time to acknowledge that boards of education and superintendents of schools are, in the long run, the primary accountability points for such results as test scores, just as corporate executives are the primary accountability points for long-term growth and profit. Holding teachers directly accountable for test scores is no more defensible than is holding a first line supervisor at General Motors accountable for the profit of the corporation. What teachers can and should be held accountable for is engaging in those practices that most effectively produce the management results that research and theory suggest to be most closely associated with the outcomes desired of the schooling enterprise. Research provides some strong hints about what some of these management results might be, but board members and superintendents who endorse these management results should do so in the full knowledge that they alone are accountable for the results of what they endorse.

'Centralized Decentralization'

Naive interpretations of the literature on effective schools could lead one to the conclusion that the question of centralization versus decentralization has at least been resolved. For some, the effective schools literature suggests that every school building is a kingdom unto itself and that effective kingdoms are those having strong kings. This is a mistaken interpretation of the literature. Strong leadership at the building level is a critical determinant of an effective school. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that the principal is or should be the only, or necessarily the best, source of strong leadership. What

the effective schools literature demonstrates is that effective principals are those who provide *or cause others to provide* strong leadership.

The obligation of system-level policy-makers, therefore, is to assure the presence of strong leadership in each school building. Fostering the emergence of such leadership through the assigning of principals, the training of principals and the training of teacher leaders (e.g., department chairpersons or lead teachers) is a central responsibility of school superintendents and their staffs. (Grove, the CEO of Intel, regularly teaches a class for beginning managers of his corporation; see Grove, 1983). It is also a responsibility that should not be delegated to a building-level unit. One of the most critical decisions district-level policy-makers must make concerns the development of clear and explicit statements of what is meant by effective leadership. Equally important, they must decide what kinds of indicators are to be used to show that effective leadership is present. For example, some boards of education implicitly define effective leaders as those who have little or no trouble with staff or parents. The indicators of effectiveness are frequently nothing more than the rate and frequency of staff and parental complaints. Though one might argue with this definition of effective leadership, the point is that most definitions of effectiveness can and do have measurable indicators.

In addition to the identification, placement and development of building-level leadership, there are other functions that cannot and should not be decentralized. Chief among these are: (1) the development and articulation of the guiding goals of the school system; and (2) the development and specifications of the indicators that would be used to assess the effectiveness with which goals are pursued. Such processes should be diffuse throughout the system. All should participate, but it is a central responsibility to assure that the processes go on.

If both equity and excellence are ends worthy of pursuit, then determinations of the goals to be pursued and the standards of performance to be acceptable in this pursuit of goals cannot be left up to individual building units. Ironically, it is the failure to understand this basic fact that has made the effective schools literature possible in the first place. Indeed, it was the wide variance in the performance of students in the same school system on measures of achievement of basic skills that led to the notion of 'outlier' schools and thus to the notion of 'effective schools'.

In the area of basic skills, the attainment of which is so critical to future life, individual faculties and individual principals should not be permitted to choose whether they will pursue such goals or choose what standards will be used to determine the effectiveness with which these goals are achieved. Such decisions must be made collectively, with significant contributions from all concerned constituencies, but the ultimate authority for making such decisions lies with the community and those who represent the community.

Given this seemingly strong argument for centralization, the argument will now be reversed. Just as there are some things that cannot or should not be decentralized, there are some things that cannot be or should not be centralized. Chief among these are: (1) identifying and clarifying those conditions and factors that impede the effectiveness with which the building unit and/or classroom teachers pursue the goals they are assigned; (2) the development and implementation of plans and programs intended to address the problems that may have been identified; (3) decisions regarding what resources and

personnel are needed to implement plans; and (4) decisions regarding how such resources should be assigned.

In summary, while it is the function of the central administration to determine what goals are to be pursued and to establish indicators for measuring the effectiveness of goal pursuits, it is the function of those directly responsible for implementing programs to design and manage those programs in ways that their understanding of the local situation indicates to be most effective.

There are many grey areas regarding what should be centralized and what should be decentralized. For example, some educators argue that personnel assignment, including who should be employed and under what conditions, should be strictly a building-level concern. Some argue that the building-level units should have considerable fiscal autonomy. However, such decisions can only be made on a case-by-case basis. For example, if one of the goals of a school system is to pursue the concept of a unitary school district to the point that both teachers and administrators would place their loyalty to the total school system above their loyalty to a building-level constituency, then centralized control of personnel assignments and transfers would make considerable sense. On the other hand, if it is held that each building's student constituency is unique and that only a cohesive faculty with intimate knowledge of that constituency's peculiarities could serve them effectively, then it might make sense to give the building-level unit considerable autonomy in personnel assignment and placement.

Issues related to centralization are more than political issues. What should and should not be centralized is a pedagogical issue as well. What should be centralized and to what degree is a critical decision; and once made, the decision may need to be re-examined if circumstances change, new problems emerge and different goals gain emphasis. Furthermore, such decisions should always be made against a single criterion: what will be the impact of the capacity of the school to develop and maintain the human resources it now has to recruit and attract the kind of human potential likely to be needed in the future?

Problems and Growth

One of the most interesting lessons taught by both the effective schools literature and the literature on America's best-run companies is that problem-identification and problem-solving cannot be separated. As Drucker (1973) points out, there can be no divorce of planning from doing. Tacitly, wise teachers and administrators long have understood that the master curriculum guide served more to satisfy the needs of the central office and regional accrediting offices than it served to direct activity in the classroom.

Furthermore, it is well and good to suggest that teachers and building-level administrators should actively involve themselves in problem-identification and problem-solving, but such an activity can only become productive in an environment in which it is all right to have a problem in the first place. For example, many teachers and building principals rightly fear the growing tendency to publish test scores in local newspapers precisely because they perceive such activities as blame-placing strategy rather than as problem-identification strategy. What school board members and superintendents must

understand is that schools with the lowest test scores do have problems, but it is in no way clear what those problems might be or how they might be resolved. Furthermore, it does no more good to tell a building principal and his/her faculty that they will be held accountable for improving test scores than it does to tell the weakest hitter on a baseball team to quit striking out. What is needed is help, encouragement, support and incentives, not blame.

Outside a specific context it is difficult to suggest specific policies that school boards might institute to foster creative problem-identification and creative problem-solving, for these are more matters of tone and texture than policy. Yet such matters cannot be or should not be too easily dismissed. The creative capacities of teachers and building administrators cannot be liberated in an atmosphere of fear and threat. If nurturance and support are expected at the bottom, then an attitude of nurturance and support must start at the top. The creation of such attitudes is a result of management and, as such, is a result for which superintendents and school boards are most accountable.

Local policy-makers should recognize that change and improvement are a non-linear process. Sometimes specific change efforts will produce what appear to be undesirable outcomes in the short run. For example, except in unusual cases, the short-term consequences of moving a faculty which has grown comfortable with a bureaucratic structure to the more collegial and non-bureaucratic forms of governance suggested by the idea of teacher as executive, are likely to include a temporary decrease in faculty morale, an increase in faculty turnover and an increase of complaints that the administration is not doing its job. What policy-makers must keep in mind is that the norms and values which give high priority to disciplined problem-solving and continuous improvement are substantially different from the norms appropriate to routinization, to standardization and to the maintenance and defence of the status quo. In a hostile environment problems are perceived as threats to the social order. In beleaguered and threatened organizations problems are to be coped with, dealt with, hidden or submerged as quickly as possible so that the real business of the organization can continue (i.e., the business of doing business as usual). In effective knowledge-work organizations, including effective schools, problem-seeking and problem-solving are the lifeblood of the organization. Problems are accepted as normal events and not as signs of organizational pathology. Failure to solve problems is tolerated in the short run, just as success in solving problems in the long run is rewarded.

In summary, if boards of education and administrators are serious about encouraging the restructuring of schools, they must be willing to do some things which are not characteristic of boards of education and managers of public bureaucracies. Most of all, they must be willing to tolerate problem-causing as well as problem-solving, and they must recognize that change and improvement cause problems as well as resolving problems. Thus policy-makers and other administrators must develop a long-term view and the patience that such a view suggests. At the same time policy-makers and top administrators must choose and emphasize key results that convey impatience and an action orientation.

Continuity of Development

Promoting and developing the conditions described in the preceding sections of this chapter are critical if the intent is to foster the systematic restructuring of schools. However, clear goals, measurable results, a commitment to the development of human resources and a problem-solving orientation are likely to have little significant impact if school boards and superintendents fail to appreciate that school improvement is a long-run developmental process rather than a short-term result. Effective schools are not simply good schools. Effective schools are schools in which there is a strong commitment to getting better and being more effctive, and this commitment is shared by almost all who participate in the life of the school. Somehow the persons who function in these schools have, in Drucker's terms, 'learned to run at one and the same time an existing managerial organization and a new innovative organization' (Drucker, 1973, p. 31). To achieve this end, they have learned to think in terms of effectiveness rather than efficiency and in terms of the long run as well as the short run.

It is one of the unfortunate facts of public life that political realities are such that efficiency (i.e., productivity at the lowest cost in the shortest time) rather than effectiveness (i.e., increasing that capacity of the organization to meet future demands as well as present needs) is likely to be a prime value. Furthermore, there is a strong drive for short-term, quick-fix answers rather than long-term fundamental solutions. There are many reasons for this condition. For example, school systems that experience high turnover in the superintendent's office have a difficult time maintaining continuity of direction. Faculty turnover and school board elections can have similar effects. However, one of the greatest barriers to the establishment of the norms of continuous improvement (Little, 1982, pp. 325–40) is the uncertainty of continued funding and continued support for projects once started. One of the greatest sources of resistance to change in schools and one of the greatest barriers to the development of commitment to the change process is the generalized view among teachers and building-level administrators that those who manage school systems and the boards that set policies for schools are unable or unwilling to sustain the momentum that is required to assure continuous improvement (Schlechty and Joslin, 1986).

Many of the factors which create the conditions that discourage continuous improvements are, in the short run at least, beyond the control of local boards and local superintendents. The introduction of a newly elected board member or the employment of a new superintendent will and should bring some changes in direction. The tendency for schools to be budgeted on an annual basis and the lack of assured dollars (especially in the areas of research, staff development and program development) are realities that cannot be avoided. In spite of these realities, there are actions that can be taken by school boards and superintendents which could serve to offset some of the negative consequences that these conditions produce.

1 Existing school boards working with the present superintendent, the existing staff and perhaps outside consultants could develop in advance a systematic orientation program for a new superintendent and perhaps for new board members. The development of such an activity should probably not occur at the

time new board members are being installed or when a new superintendent is being employed. Rather such an activity should be undertaken in a period of relative stability on the board and when the tenure of the present superintendent is relatively secure. Planning for the identification and/or development of one's own replacements is a critical activity. Furthermore, such planning, and the thought that it requires, should cause present board members and superintendents to take seriously the charge of identifying and articulating the image they hold of their school system.

2 Local school boards and superintendents should seriously consider the prospect of establishing an endowment fund targeted specifically for the support of school improvement projects. Such a fund, once established, could be used to provide individual teachers and school faculties with small grants to support local school initiatives. The same funds might be used to reward faculties for inventions they produce and to support activities aimed at sharing the inventions with teachers and administrators in other schools. Perhaps the most important addition of an endowment would be that it would make it possible, if only in a small way, for the school system to foster and encourage long-term development and to supplement these long-term commitments with whatever short-term funding might be available.

3 Schools boards could and should establish policies, procedures and programs which make it possible for local school faculties to induct new teachers into the culture of the school. Faculty stability appears to be closely associated with effective schools (Purkey and Smith, 1983). Unfortunately, given the demographics of the teacher workforce, it appears likely that teacher turnover will increase dramatically over the next decade (see Schlechty and Vance, 1983; Darling-Hammond, 1984). Careful and systematic induction into the existing culture of the school is one of the most promising ways to assure the continuity of experience that will be required when demographic forces are fostering discontinuity of experience.

The critical point is that those who run schools and those who make policies for schools, if they want to encourage fundamental restructuring of schools, must carefully weigh the impact of every decision they make on the ability of local schools to maintain continuity of experience. It is this continuity, coupled with the emergence of a school culture which honors, rewards and inspires outstanding performance, that is the critical component of the second wave of school reform.

Personnel Policies and Issues

Conceiving of the teacher as an executive, the principal as a leader of leaders, and the superintendent as the CEO could cause us to reconsider the nature and function of teacher education and administrator preparation. Indeed, if the images of schools characterized here were to be embraced, it would probably cause a revolution in the areas of staff development, personnel hiring and job placement and would refocus reform proposals

regarding teacher education as well. Teacher education might well be conceived as management development. Arguments regarding certification and alternative certification would be fundamentally reformulated. For example, it might be that one function of teacher education should be to certify that teacher candidates can learn how to teach rather than that teacher candidates know how to teach. Both the preparation of teachers and the preparation of administrators would be based on the assumption that what is necessary is that they be prepared as leaders.

This is not to suggest that teachers and administrators would abandon the idea of being part of a knowledge- and research-based profession. On the contrary, it is to suggest that continuity of experience and continuity of careers would be greatly enhanced if they were based on core understandings regarding management and leadership in environments where the primary task is to work on knowledge.

Perhaps more importantly, viewing the school as a knowledge-work organization and the superintendent as the chief executive officer in such an organization should cause state-level policy-makers to be at least as attentive to issues related to the identification, development and continuing support of top-level school district administrators as they have become with the recruitment and training of teachers and building principals. Gary Sykes has referred to teacher education as higher education's 'dirty little secret'. As a former chair of a department that prepared administrators, a present member of a department of school administration and one who has had the opportunity to interview numerous deans of schools of education and many superintendents, I feel secure in saying that one of the differences between the perceived quality of teacher education and the perceived quality of administrator preparation (i.e., the preparation of top-level administrators) is that there are no secrets. Most agree that there is much need for improvement in the kinds of training and support provided for superintendents, or teachers would become superintendents.

Conclusion

This chapter has not offered a blueprint for schools of the future; rather, it has presented a vision of how schools might be reinvented so that they might become learning organizations, what Sizer (1984) has referred to as essential schools. Some will insist that I have pushed the business metaphor too far, just as I have been accused of pushing the medical metaphor too far. Perhaps. However, I am not convinced that viewing students as workers, teachers as executives, and principals as leaders of instructors is argument by analogy or analysis by metaphor. Rather, I believe that schools have long been the original knowledge-work organizations, and businesses are simply becoming more school-like. Indeed, one of the fundamental problems confronting American business is how to motivate, manage, lead and direct individuals whose primary task is to work on and with knowledge and knowledge-related products. This does not seem dissimilar from the fundamental problem which confronts those who must invent schools of the future.

There is the danger that too close an adherence to the knowledge-work model could cause education to subvert its critical function (i.e., the function of producing citizens

whose knowledge is critically held) and to subvert the liberating functions to reactionary ends. All visions are dangerous and can lead to excess, but without vision, the future will happen to us. With a clear vision, we are in position to help invent what happens.

References

BENNIS, W. and NANUS, B. (1985) *Leaders*. New York: Harper and Row.

BERLINER, D. (1983) 'Executive Functions of Teaching', *Instructor*, 93: 28–33.

DARLING-HAMMOND, L. (1984) *Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching*. Washington, DC: Rand Corporation.

DRUCKER, P. (1973) *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities and Practices*. New York: Harper and Row.

DURKHEIM, E. (1956) *Education and Sociology*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

GROVE, A. (1983) *High Output Management*. Westminster, MD: Random House.

KELLY, R. (1982) *Gold Collar Worker*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

LITTLE, J. W. (1982) 'Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions in Schools', *American Educational Research Journal* 19: 325–40.

PETERS, T. J. and WATERMAN, R. H. (1982) *In Search of Excellence*. New York: Harper and Row.

PURKEY, S. C. and SMITH, M. S. (1983) 'Effective Schools: A Review', *Elementary School Journal* 4: 427–52.

SCHLECHTY, P. (1985) 'District Level Policies and Practices: Supporting Effective School Management and Classroom Instruction' in R.M.J. KYLE (ed.) *Reaching for Excellence: An Effective Schools Handbook*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, 117–29.

SCHLECHTY, P. and JOSLIN, A. (1986) *Planning and Implementing a Teacher Career Development Program: The Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina Case*. Unpublished report on NIE Project: Washington, DC.

SCHLECHTY, P. and VANCE, V. (1983) 'Recruitment, Selection and Retention: The Shape of the Teaching Force', *Elementary School Journal* 83: 409–87.

SIZER, T. (1984) *Horace's Compromise*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

SIZER, T. (1986) 'Rebuilding First Steps by the Coalition of Essential Schools', *Phi Delta Kappan* 68: 38–42.

VIDICH, A.J. and BENSMAN (1957) *Small Town in Mass Society: Class, Power, and Religion in a Rural Community*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Notes on Contributors

Phillip Schlechty is the President of the Center for Leadership in School Reform in Louisville, Kentucky. Schlechty has published numerous books and articles on topics related to school reform and has received the AERA Professional Service Award and the AFT Quest Citation Award.

Larry Cuban is Professor of Education and Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs at Stanford University. He has initiated an ongoing Superintendents' roundtable for school superintendents in Santa Clara County to discuss policy issues and currently heads Stanford School Collaborative. He is the author of many books and articles, among them *The Managerial Imperative: The Practice of Leadership in Schools*.

David L. Clark is William Clay Parrish, Jr. Professor of Education in the Curry School of Education, University of Virginia. He has also served as professor at Ohio State University and Indiana University. His research studies and publications have included work in organizational theory, policy studies, teacher education, and the change process in education.

Judith M. Meloy is in the Office of Research and Evaluation, Connecticut State Department of Education, Hartford, Connecticut. Before this appointment, she was at Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis, researching leadership and the change process in schools and colleges.

Susan J. Rosenholtz is associate professor of education at the University of Illinois, specializing in the sociology and social psychology of education and the sociology of the classroom. Her written work is extensive with her most recent book being *Teachers' Workplace: The Social Organization of Schools*.

Judith Warren Little is assistant professor of education at the University of California at Berkeley. Her major interests are in the school as a professional environment for teachers with special attention to teachers relationships as colleagues, the workplace influence on teachers' commitment to teaching and their conceptions of a career.

Linda Darling-Hammond formerly of the Rand Corporation, is professor in the Curriculum and Teaching Department at Teachers College, Columbia University. In 1987

she was the recipient of the AFT's Quest Citation Award given in recognition of her 'outstanding contributions to education'. Her numerous articles and research on teaching policy have been very influential in the United States in the movement to professionalize teaching.

Gary A. Griffin is professor of education at the University of Arizona. His interests include school improvement, expanded leadership roles for teachers and curriculum development. He has made significant contributions to our understanding of the initial years of teaching exemplified in the publication *The First Years of Teaching*.

Milbrey W. McLaughlin is associate professor at Stanford University. She is the Director of the Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching. Her policy analysis and research is concerned with planned change and the secondary school context.

David Marsh is professor of education in the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Southern California. His most recent work has been concerned with state policy on staff development and school reform.

Gary Sykes is assistant professor of education at Michigan State University, where he also serves on the staff of the Holmes Group. He also consults regularly with the recently formed National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. His research includes the policy effects on teachers and teaching, teacher education, and the assessment of teaching.

Ann Lieberman is professor of education at the University of Washington, on leave as Visiting Professor at Teachers College, Columbia University. She has written widely on collaborative research, the social realities of teaching and the expanding role for teachers. Her research, development and policy interests are with restructuring schools and the roles of teachers.

Terry Deal is professor of education and human development at Peabody College of Vanderbilt University. His major research interests include; organizations, change and leadership with a particular focus on the role of symbols in the human experience. His forthcoming book is to be published by Jossey-Bass with a working title of *Reframing Organizations: The Artistry of Leadership* with Lee Bolman.

Seymour Sarason is professor of psychology at Yale University, is founder and former director of the Yale Psycho-educational Clinic. He is the author of numerous books, including *The Psychological Sense of Community* and *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*.

Lynne Miller is associate professor of education in the department of professional education at the University of Southern Maine and Director of the Southern Maine partnership. Her major research interests include staff development, school reform and the restructuring of schools.

Index

Absenteeism of teachers 89, 104, 117, 118
alternative schools 15, 131, 132
American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T) 129, 139
autonomy
  fiscal 242, 250
  of teachers 25, 33–4, 37, 108, 120–2, 174, 235–7
  and CLPs 89, 90
  and MCT 80, 82, 83, 87

Basic Skills Program 82, 85–8, 93, 97
beginning teachers 35, 36, 171–6
Bell System 128–9, 132, 139, 140
boards of education 45–7, 92
  schools reform 234–5, 238, 240, 242–3, 245, 248–9, 251
  see also school boards

Canada 106
career ladder plans (CLPs) 17, 80, 86, 88–97, 110, 122, 174, 177, 202–3
careers of teachers 14, 112, 154, 107–8, 204, 254
  advancement 36, 43, 198
  colleagues 171, 174, 177
  effects of war 52, 54, 56–8
Carnegie 27, 198, 233, 237
ceremonies 128–30, 134, 137–40, 143–4
certification 11, 32–3, 36–7, 237, 238, 254
Challenger Space Shuttle 72
Change Agent Study *see* Rand Study
Chrysler 132
class size 37, 76, 109, 114, 115, 122
concentration camps 135, 136, 142
curriculum 4, 34–5, 47, 117, 119, 121, 168, 195–209
  change 71, 73–7, 222, 227–9, 243
  development 10, 14, 20, 31, 40–3, 154
  MCT 81–4, 87, 97
  standardized 26–8, 44, 45, 120, 250
  teamwork 167–71, 173–4, 178–87

dailiness of teaching 153, 156–62, 202
death as life change 127, 130, 134–7, 140–2
'Decade of Reform' (1965–75) 213
Department of Mental Health 67
desegregation 67
Dewey, John 26, 27, 58, 60, 66
dropouts 25, 26, 29, 44, 242

Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975) 73
Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) 73
evaluation 4, 31–3, 47–8, 73, 77, 196, 198, 205–6, 244
  beginning teachers 173
  of curriculum 200–1
  in effective schools 117–19
  as intrusion 159
  in open-space schools 170–1
  by peers 17, 20, 36, 38–42, 108, 116
  pre-tenure 43
  of principals 233
  standards 79, 91–5
  by students 161
  team teaching 185

261

faculty 14, 42, 178, 181, 187–8, 203, 216, 230
  beginning teachers 172, 175
  CLP 89, 90
  curriculum 200–2
  gender 120
  goals 117, 119, 235
  resources 44
  responsibilities 47, 66–7
  ritual and ceremony 138, 139, 144
  school reform 243, 246–53
  war 54
first-order changes 72–7
First World War 52, 56

GI Bill of Rights 52, 54, 56, 59, 60
Gibson, James 'Ground Theory' 64
gold-collar workers 236–7, 243
Great Depression 54, 56, 59
'Ground Theory' 64

Holmes Group 37, 198, 233

induction of teachers 35–6, 39, 42–3, 253
in-service programs 108, 117, 179–80, 184, 230, 248
  CLPs 89, 90
  education 204, 207, 213–14, 218, 224–6, 228
  relevance 154
isolation 159, 227
  beginning teachers 172
  principals 209
  teachers 38, 40–1, 108, 154, 165–6, 205

Japan 40, 132, 141
  and war 53, 135
job security 108, 114

life change units 136–7
Lortie, Dan 106–8, 113, 154, 172–3, 181, 229

merit pay 16, 74, 108, 122
minimum competency testing (MCT) 28, 80–8, 92, 96–7
morale 86, 93–5, 199, 251

National Commission on Excellence in Education 79
National Defense Education Act (1958) 73
National Governors' Association Task Force 233
National Institute of Mental Health 55

parents 25–6, 40–1, 44, 105, 106
  ceremonies 129, 144
  expectations 28, 30, 48
  relationship with school 132, 133, 243, 245, 249
  responsibilities 45, 47
  volunteer helpers 87, 202
  war 52, 53
pay of teachers 71, 88, 108, 110–12, 217
  see also salaries
principals 42–5, 47, 71, 73, 117, 160–1
  CLPs 88–9, 93–4
  curriculum 195–7, 199, 205, 207–9
  evaluation 38, 41, 93, 94, 233
  Rand Study 216, 217, 221–3
  ritual and ceremony 129, 138–9, 143–4
  role 4, 6, 9–11, 20, 77
  school reform 233–5, 237, 241–3, 245–51, 253–4
  staff development 214, 227, 230–1
  team teaching 166, 169, 171, 183–5
  turnover 118–19
prisoners of war 135, 142
private schools 15, 25, 106, 112, 237
probationary teachers 88, 89
promotion of teachers 14, 20, 27
Public Law 94–142, 67

quality circles 17, 19

racism 55, 56
Rand Study (Change Agent Study) 214–18, 220–32
recruitment of teachers 14, 36, 104, 116, 122
rituals 128, 130, 134, 137–8, 140–3, 146–7, 157

salaries 14, 20, 36, 43, 107, 122, 177, 202
  CLP 92, 94
  differentials 114–15, 122
  first-order change 73, 74, 76
  incentive 114–16
  private schools 106, 237
  see also pay
SAT scores 115
school boards 10, 13, 41–2, 166
  reform 246–7, 250–3
  team teaching 185
  see also boards of education
Second World War 52–60, 63, 64
secondary jobs for teachers 112
second-order change 72–7
shortages of teachers 32, 37, 79, 109

Sputnik 51
State Education Agencies (SEA) 98
status
  CLP 88
  differences 177
  principals 196
  staff development 213
  teachers 25, 38–9, 79, 107–8, 197–8, 208, 237–8, 243
  team teaching 184–5

teachers' learning opportunities 89–91, 117, 220
teacher-run schools 73, 76
team teaching 108, 131, 165, 167–71, 175, 180–8
tuition tax credits 105
Tennessee 80–2, 84, 92, 93, 98, 132
tenure of teachers 14, 20, 39, 41, 48, 213, 224
test scores of students 29, 48, 118, 247–8, 250–1
Theories X, Y and Z 6–9, 11, 13–19
truancy 44
turnover of teachers 104, 112, 115, 118–19, 176, 223, 251–3

vandalism 25, 44
verbal ability of teachers 79, 224, 225, 231
Veterans' Association 55
voucher plans 73, 76, 105, 131

School Development and the Management of Change Series

Series Editors: **Peter Holly** and **Geoff Southworth**
Cambridge Institute of Education, Cambridge, CB2 2BX, UK

THE DEVELOPING SCHOOL
Peter Holly and Geoff Southworth, Cambridge Institute of Education, UK

HERE COMES THE ASSEMBLY MAN
A Year in the Life of a Primary School
Fred Sedgwick, UK

SCHOOLS AS COLLABORATIVE CULTURES
Creating the Future Now
Edited by Ann Lieberman, University of Washington, USA

PRIMARY EDUCATION
From Plowden to the 1990s
Norman Thomas, Honorary Professor at the University of Warwick, UK

THE MANAGEMENT OF CHANGE IN THE PRIMARY SCHOOL
Implementing the National Curriculum in Science and Design Technology
Anne Pennell and David Alexander, Bedfordshire Education Service, UK

SEMI-DETACHED TEACHERS
Building Support and Advisory Relationships in Classrooms
Colin Biott, Newcastle upon Tyne Polytechnic, UK

Schools as Collaborative Cultures is a collection of essays by some of the best commentators on school reform that American education has to offer. It provides rich testimony to the power of teacher collaboration within school development. As Holly and Southworth maintained in the lead volume to this series (Holly and Southworth, 1989), teacher collaboration is a key activity in the developing school. The contributions offered here provide a set of improvisations on the same theme; that each school needs to establish a collaborative culture as a precondition for its own development. Associated themes touched upon include: bureaucratic schooling (the antithesis of collaborative schooling); democratic leadership; teacher professionalism and teacher leadership; teacher involvement in decision-making and 'colleagueship' (or collegiality). Moreover, many of the authors represented here equate teacher collaboration with teacher empowerment, an enhanced sense of professionalism and, indeed, the restructuring of schooling.

Ann Lieberman is professor of education at the University of Washington, on leave as Visiting Professor at Teachers College, Columbia University. She has written widely on collaborative research, the social realities of teaching and the expanding role for teachers. Her research, development and policy interests are with restructuring schools and the roles of teachers.

Cover design by Caroline Archer

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ISBN 1 85000 673 3